

Historic, Archive Document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.



LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

Public Law 179--82nd Congress

Chapter 512--1st Session

H. R. 5054

TABLE OF CONTENT

Digest of Public Law 179	1
Index and Summary of H. R. 5054	2

DIGEST OF PUBLIC LAW 179

DEFENSE DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION ACT, 1952: Appropriates funds for the National Security Council, National Security Resources Board, and the military functions of the Department of Defense. Provides \$50,000,000 for civilian relief in Korea. Provides, under the item "Subsistence of the Army", that no funds contained in the act shall be used for the payment of any subsidy on agricultural or other products; and provides that no funds in the act shall be available for the "procurement of any article of food or clothing not grown or produced in the United States or its possessions, except to the extent that the Secretary of the Department concerned shall determine that a satisfactory quality and sufficient quantity of any articles of food or clothing grown or produced in the United States or its possessions cannot be procured as and when needed at United States market prices." Prohibits the use of funds for payments to educational institutions for the training of file clerks, stenographers, and typists receiving compensation at the rate below the minimum rate of grade GS-5. Directs the Secretary of Defense to assist American small business to participate equitably in the furnishing of commodities and services to the armed services. Authorizes the President to provide for 10 temporary positions in the Office of the Secretary of Defense, 5 at GS-17 and 5 at GS-18. Provides a ceiling of 500,000 full-time graded civilian employees in the military departments.

INDEX AND SUMMARY OF H. R. 5054

May 7, 1951 House Hearings - Part 1, Office of Secretary of Defense

June 6, 1951 Hearings: House - Part 2, Department of Army

May 8, 1951 Hearings: House - Part 3, Department of Navy

July 2, 1951 Hearings: House - Part 4, Department of Air Force

June 7, 1951 Hearings: Senate

August 6, 1951 Mr. Mahon from the House Committee on Appropriations submitted House Report 790. Print of bill as reported.

August 8, 1951 House began debate on H. R. 5054

August 9, 1951 House concluded debate and passed H. R. 5054 with amendments.

August 10, 1951 Read twice in the Senate and referred to the Committee on Appropriations. Print of bill as referred to the Senate.

September 7, 1951 Senate reported H. R. 5054 with amendments. Senate Report 730. Print of bill as reported in the Senate.

September 10, 1951 Senate began debate on H. R. 5054.

September 11, 1951 Senate continued debate on H. R. 5054

September 12, 1951 Continued debate on H. R. 5054 in the Senate

September 13, 1951 Senate concluded debate and passed H. R. 5054 with amendments.

Senate appointed conferees

September 17, 1951 House appointed conferees

October 2, 1951 Conferees agreed to file report.

October 3, 1951 Conferees given till midnight to file report.

October 4, 1951 House received conference report on H. R. 5054 House Report 1097.

October 5, 1951 House agreed to Conference Report.

October 11, 1951 Senate received conference report.

Conference Report on H. R. 5054 made unfinished business

October 12, 1951 Senate agreed to Conference Report.

October 18, 1951 Approved: Public Law 179

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

AUGUST 6, 1951.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

MR. MAHON, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H. R. 5054]

The Committee on Appropriations submits the following report in explanation of the accompanying bill (H. R.—) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and related activities for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952.

GENERAL STATEMENT

The bill carries the regular annual appropriations for all activities under the control of the National Security Council; National Security Resources Board; Office of the Secretary of Defense, the Armed Forces Policy Board, the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Joint Staff, the Munitions Board, and the Research and Development Board; the Department of the Army; the Department of the Navy; and the Department of the Air Force. The various items in the bill have been separated into five titles for convenience of consideration.

The category breakdown of the request indicates that military personnel costs will approximate \$10,475,809,000; operation and maintenance \$12,264,400,000; major procurement and production costs \$29,743,381,000; civilian components \$713,751,000; research and development \$1,472,632,000; industrial mobilization \$143,555,000; establishment-wide activities \$1,337,198,000. The request for construction and acquisition of real property in the amount of \$4,500,000,000, has not been considered in this bill but will be for later con-

sideration by the Congress, the authorization for such funds being included in the bill H. R. 4914 now before the Congress.

The estimates for appropriation for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year 1952 were presented to the House of Representatives in House Document No. 120 on April 30, 1951, and provided, in general, requests for appropriations for the National Security Council in the amount of \$160,000; National Security Resources Board, \$1,600,000; Office of the Secretary of Defense, \$544,800,000; Department of the Army, \$20,798,845,700; Department of the Navy, \$15,737,920,000; and the Department of the Air Force, \$20,494,000,000.

SUBMISSION OF THE DEFENSE BUDGET

Sec. 201 of the act approved September 12, 1950 (Public Law 784, 81st Congress) provides that

The President shall transmit to Congress during the first fifteen days of each regular session, the Budget, which shall set forth his Budget message, summary data and text, and supporting detail.

This provision of law is called to the attention of those responsible for the delay in submitting the estimates and the supporting data. Because of failure to receive the estimates and supporting data on time it was not possible for the committee to complete consideration of the requirements and present a bill to the House in due season and prior to the end of fiscal year 1951. Hereafter the committee and the Congress will insist that the Budget, summary data and text, and supporting detail be received within the time limit prescribed by the above act. The committee, of course, realizes the unusual world conditions which have existed in recent months.

OBJECTIVES OF THE DEFENSE BUDGET

During the hearings on the request for appropriations for the Department of Defense the committee had for consideration, in addition to the normal requirements for the security of the nation, the sharp impact of the Korean war and the disturbing events throughout the world, which gave to the hearings a serious evaluation of requirements not often experienced. The committee is conscious of the need for a defense sufficient to avert disaster and to successfully retaliate in the event of attack. To accomplish this it is necessary to have in being a well trained and balanced force ready for immediate action, forming the nucleus for rapid expansion, supported by mobilization machinery in the Armed Forces and in industry which can be thrown into high gear in the event of an all out emergency.

General of the Army Omar N. Bradley when appearing before the committee a few days ago stated objectives which the committee can adopt as follows:

In broad outline, the basic military objectives which have guided our strategic analysis are these: To build sufficient force as soon as practicable to act as a deterrent to further aggression; to create sufficient power to prevent disaster in the event war is forced upon us; to provide an immediate capability for quick and strong retaliation in case of an attack upon us; and, to produce a firm base upon which to build, as quickly as possible, that power necessary to assure victory should we be forced to engage in all-out conflict.

MILITARY PERSONNEL

It was represented to the committee that funds requested would provide a military man-year strength for the Army of 1,531,200; for the Navy 805,000, Marine Corps 175,516; Air Force 1,061,000; civilian component man-year strength for the Army National Guard 320,000, ORC 205,000, ROTC Senior Division students 45,000, basic students 96,000, and students in the Junior Division 60,000; civilian man-year strength, Army 549,088; Navy, including Marine Corps, 505,755; and Air Force 319,409.

At the end of fiscal year 1951 it was found that the estimated military strengths had not been attained but it is estimated that through voluntary enlistments and Selective Service the forces will be supplied with the required strengths throughout the year. Due to failure to have in the services the estimated numbers as of July 1, 1951, there has been made appropriate reductions in the funds requested. These reductions were not made to reduce the military personnel strengths but only to take advantage of the savings that could be made because such strengths were not realized.

KOREAN WAR COSTS

The committee was advised on numerous occasions throughout the hearings that the budget presentation did not include any estimates for financing the Korean war after June 30, 1951. This decision was made several months ago when the budget was being prepared and was made solely for budgetary purposes in the belief that estimates of combat consumption of material in Korea could more realistically be made at a later date. It was pointed out to the committee that losses and attrition in Korea after June 30, 1951, would be the subject of a supplemental budget request some months hence. The late Admiral Sherman on May 8, 1951, when making his presentation to the committee upon this point stated—

Last December when the preparation of the fourth supplemental 1951 and the estimates for fiscal year 1952 was commenced it was impracticable to determine when the hostilities in Korea might end. It was impracticable to estimate very far ahead the tempo of combat and consequent fiscal requirements. It was, therefore, decided that estimates covering the remainder of fiscal year 1951 would include appropriations to cover combat requirements. It was decided that the estimates for the fiscal year 1952 would provide only for a base—a year of steady sustained expansion toward approved force levels, accelerated training, and commencing the acquisition of realistic mobilization reserve levels of supply or their equivalent in the broadening of the mobilization base. This will, of course, make it necessary to submit supplementary estimates to cover the additional costs arising from combat operations as their intensity and duration are determined.

The committee in its consideration of the estimates has undertaken to provide funds to support the policies of the Department of Defense in the effort to build a force sufficient to deter aggression, but in the event of an unprovoked aggression upon us to have sufficient power to resist and prevent disaster; to provide the capability of a quick and sustained counterattack; and to enlarge the industrial base in order that augmented forces, if required, may be provided with the necessary equipment and materials, all of which in the minds of the committee is building towards peace in the world.

JUSTIFICATIONS OF THE ESTIMATES

The books of justifications presented to the committee in support of the estimates for fiscal year 1952 were most inadequate in that they failed to make clear information required each year by the committee and the Congress before action can be taken on annual appropriation bills. Information by the departments was not set forth in readily comparable form and in a uniform manner; for example, personnel information was particularly difficult to obtain and was not contained in the books of justification where it should be readily available. Members were forced to develop from witnesses through long and tedious questioning and from material submitted in addition to the justifications, information that should have been readily available in the books of justifications.

The chief consideration of a witness should be "know your project", know the program proposed and know what has been the program at least for the preceding fiscal year—how much it has cost, comparison between objectives, personnel required, etc. It is the responsibility of the department to present witnesses to explain its requirements and the person with the most complete information on the subject-matter should be called in each instance. The answer to a question that the information will be submitted for the record has been worn threadbare—witnesses are all too ready with this suggestion. Readily available information is what the Committee needs.

Much of the failure to provide the Committee with adequate information is due to delays on the part of policy making officials rather than to those directly responsible for the preparation of the justifications. Instances have come to the attention of the Committee where policy making officials would take almost unlimited time to arrive at a decision and then direct those responsible for supporting details and justifications to come up with such details within 24 or 48 hours—an impossible task to be accomplished accurately in such a short time. The results were, in some instances, unrealistic estimates, more frequently on the high rather than the low side, because of insufficient time to determine actual requirements to meet the programs finally determined. Such procrastination by policy making officials was largely responsible for the late submission of this budget. Earlier in the report it is stated that this procedure should be corrected and that succeeding budgets should be submitted on time.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ECONOMIES

The program for which the funds are requested is the program of the President, the Department of Defense, and other security agencies, as submitted to the Congress, to provide security for the Nation. The committee has considered the request, spending some eleven weeks in hearings and many more days studying the requirements, and in the recommendations contained herein has attempted to provide the funds necessary to carry the program into effect. The estimates were prepared several months ago upon the best information available at that time. In some instances better information now available indicates that adjustments may safely and profitably be made. The committee in making its recommendations has indicated where savings can be effected and has made suitable reductions. For instance the hearings revealed the inadequacy of manpower controls, and numerous in-

stances will be found where the committee has requested the departments concerned to inaugurate strict manpower controls in order that civilian personnel may be reduced to the irreducible minimum. A breakdown of reductions in the bill because of reductions in requests for civilian employment will disclose a savings in dollars of \$145,-130,500. Likewise the committee feels there has been great abuse in the use of overtime and suggests that in many instances the use of such overtime could be completely eliminated by the use of compensatory time—that is by permitting an employee to have time off for overtime worked. It is entirely necessary in some instances that activities—such as at the Pentagon Building—be open for business on Saturday, but employees who work on a Saturday should be given equal time off during the following week.

The charge that there has been a hoarding of blue-collar workers is not without foundation, and, while the committee is unwilling to reduce production activities and maintenance where blue collar workers are employed, it does suggest the closest supervision of such employment with a view to eliminating unnecessary costs.

One of the most fertile fields for economy is in procurement costs. The committee feels that all the services should scrutinize procurement policies and seek to get a dollar in value for each dollar spent. The committee deplores the practice, information of which has recently been made public, of improper relations between procurement officials and representatives of firms from whom they procure millions of dollars worth of equipment, and so forth. The committee deplores all indications that there is a mixed loyalty on the part of procurement officials or persons representing the Government in the procurement program.

Large sums of money are provided for the procurement of many civilian-type items and unless there is proper management of the expenditure of such funds serious effects may be had upon the economy of the Nation. Ill-advised shotgun buying of certain civilian-type items can have and does have a very inflationary tendency upon prices and marketing procedures. Evidence of some such abuses has come to the attention of the committee and it has cautioned the procurement agencies to coordinate the buying programs and spread purchases in such a way that the impact of the buying upon the economy of the Nation will be at a minimum consistent with the urgency of the military build-up.

The committee wishes to sound a note of caution with respect to military promotion policies and suggests a study be made to determine a proper policy in keeping with merit and responsibility. There should be no piling up of top grades in excessive numbers. It has been pointed out that tables of organization permit of the numbers approved. If the tables of organizations permit too many high ranking grades or too rapid promotions, it may be necessary to give consideration to the changing of such tables of organizations.

The committee has been concerned at the numbers of both military and civilian personnel assigned to public information and publicity work and directs that in apportioning personnel reductions effected throughout the bill that sharp reductions be made in such personnel in the Pentagon and throughout the Services.

The committee again wishes to call to the attention of responsible officials the large requests for funds for travel. A great amount of

travel is, of course, necessary to the defense program, but many movements of troops from one section of the country to another could be avoided and funds saved. It is not uncommon to find members of the military forces who, within a short period of time, have had permanent assignments in most every section of the country. Responsible officials should be as interested in providing the best trained and most efficient military personnel as are members of the Congress and at as little expense to the taxpayers of the Nation, but there is room for improvement and the committee calls these matters to the attention of such responsible officials in order that studies may be inaugurated and corrections made.

REVERSION OF UNOBLIGATED BALANCES TO THE TREASURY

It has been ascertained that of the \$19,264,152,143 appropriated during fiscal year 1951 to the Army \$74,874,172 was not required and reverted to "Miscellaneous Funds" of the Treasury at the end of the fiscal year; of the \$12,462,074,300 appropriated to the Navy \$77,241,931 reverted; and of the \$15,791,061,000 appropriated to the Air Force \$52,368,732 reverted. The failure of the Services to expend or obligate all moneys made available is subject to varied interpretations. To some it may mean a poor job of estimating the requests made to the Congress during fiscal year 1951; to others it may mean that the Services, in an effort to do a creditable job, have found places where it has been possible to effectuate savings. It should be pointed out that ordinarily budget estimates are prepared months in advance of the time when the funds are to be spent and under such circumstances, with world conditions as they are, it is impossible to estimate with accuracy the exact requirements. The committee wishes to commend and encourage the Services in not spending or obligating funds which are not essential or required. Conditions are sure to change, and the committee likes to feel that, when such changes will permit of savings, the Services can be depended upon to take advantage of them and permit the excess funds to revert to the miscellaneous funds of the Treasury.

The committee throughout the hearings and in this report has attempted to bring to the attention of proper officials abuses that few will deny exist—some to a greater degree than others—in the hope that through proper cooperation corrections can be made.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The Secretary of Defense, assisted by his official family sets the objectives of the Department of Defense, determines the policies to be followed, and formulates the basic programs and supervises the operations of the Department. Within the official family are the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Joint Staff, the Armed Forces Policy Council, the Munitions Board, and the Research and Development Board, all of which assist the Secretary in the performance of his functions.

To accomplish the objectives and carry out the policies and programs inaugurated there is requested an appropriation of \$14,800,000, which, in addition to providing funds for the immediate Office of the

Secretary of Defense, also includes funds for the civilian salaries and other expenses incident to the administration of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and Joint Staff, the Munitions Board, the Research and Development Board, the Military Liaison Committee to the Atomic Energy Commission, and the United States portion of the permanent standing group of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, together with other agencies which have been established to assist the Secretary in carrying out his responsibilities in specific fields, such as weapons evaluation, medical policies, military traffic management, and guided missiles.

The major portion of funds requested for this appropriation is for the pay of civilian personnel, a total of 2,091 permanent positions being requested. This reflects an increase of only 1 position over the number required during fiscal year 1951, but is an increase of the average number of employees of almost 300. The requested increase in dollar requirements is \$2,500,000.

The committee recommends a reduction of \$1,000,000 in the request to be applied against 300 man-years of civilian employment and suggests that, among other reductions, substantial reductions be made in personnel in the public information activities.

RETIRED PAY

The appropriation request for "Retired Pay" in the amount of \$360,000,000 is to provide for pay of military personnel on the retired lists of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force. Information before the committee indicated that the appropriation request for fiscal year 1951 was overestimated. More retired personnel are being called back into service which should reduce the requirements, and in the opinion of the committee more careful scrutiny should be given to requests for retirement of persons who have not reached the legal age limit for retirement. On the basis of these facts and on past experience the committee recommends a reduction of \$15,000,000 in this request leaving for appropriation \$345,000,000.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

GENERAL STATEMENT

The major missions of the Army as stated by General J. Lawton Collins, Chief of Staff, are—

To maintain adequate forces in occupation areas and to man strategic oversea bases with a strength sufficient to meet extended emergencies, including armed aggression.

To aid in bringing the war in Korea to a successful conclusion while maintaining the security of Japan.

To develop a general reserve of sufficient size and readiness to provide for the security of the United States. This build-up must include provision for adequate forces in being with sufficient logistical support to permit their deployment and to sustain their combat operations in the event of war.

It was with those requirements in mind that the committee considered the requests for appropriations to carry such missions to a successful conclusion. The demands upon our military forces, when decision was made to enter Korea and with other members of the United Nations defend the principles which provide and protect our way of life, were great and the costs correspondingly high, not

only in money but in manpower, matériel, and facilities. Funds which have been provided in supplemental appropriations during the past fiscal year have accomplished much towards establishing and broadening our defense and our potential strength. Funds herein requested and recommended are to continue the build-up of that strength—not to the point required to fight an all-out-war, but to permit the creation and operation of a sizeable production base, to equip active forces, and to provide a part of the necessary war reserve. As stated by the Secretary of the Army in discussing the decisions adopted—

* * * the Army accepted the calculated risk involved in placing maximum reliance upon a continuing but rapid expandable production potential rather than upon huge stocks of war reserves on hand.

The request of the Army for \$20,798,845,700 as its part of the defense budget is broken down by appropriations and shown in the table appearing on page 148 of this report.

It will be noted that there are some rather large reductions in procurement and production which have been made after careful examination of the estimates. While the estimates presented were generally sound and represented only a part of the ultimate requirements, the rush and pressure under which the estimates were assembled resulted in areas of unbalance between programs in which a rescheduling of the proposed procurement deliveries more in accord with the industrial situation would allow deferments to later financing. Such deferments are difficult of exact assessment but have been approximated in the Signal Corps, Engineer Corps and Ordnance Service and Supplies.

CONTINGENCIES OF THE ARMY

The appropriation, Contingencies of the Army, for which \$88,055,000 is requested, is to provide funds for the purpose of meeting emergencies and extraordinary expenses impossible to anticipate fully or to classify and to schedule exactly. These contingency funds are to be used world-wide for the Department of the Army. They provide for such things as Congressional and Secretaries of the Army travel, Army-wide public information and exhibit activities, Provost Marshal general activities, the Inter-American Defense Board, conference reports, miscellaneous current expenses, and extraordinary military expenses. The committee recommends rounding the figure off at an even \$88,000,000.

CIVILIAN PERSONNEL, ARMY

The original request of the Department of the Army for civilian personnel was based upon an estimated requirement of 549,088 man years of employment (including project order personnel) for fiscal year 1952. The estimate was made sometime ago when the activities of the Army were on an ascending scale and were based on anticipated strengths to be reached by the end of fiscal year 1951. The recruitment of civilian employees to reach the strength anticipated for the end of fiscal year 1951 was not attained, therefore the starting strength for fiscal year 1952 was not as great as expected. When these facts became apparent, reevaluations of requirements were made, and on June 29, 1951 the Comptroller for the Department of the Army submitted to the committee revised estimates for civilian personnel

requirements indicating a reduction of 19,378 man years of employment and a reduction in dollar requirements of \$38,141,000 (see the table on page 1086, part 2, of the hearings). In making its recommendation to the House of Representatives the Committee has made adjustments throughout the bill in the various appropriations, adding the reductions estimated by the Comptroller for the Department of the Army to other reductions recommended.

The Committee was advised that it is the policy of the Department of the Army to provide for maximum utilization of civilian personnel in all positions which do not require military skill or military incumbence for reason of training, security, or discipline. Complaint has been heard in many instances that military personnel were performing duties that could be performed as well by civilian personnel and at a lesser expense to the tax payer. The Department of the Army has attempted to meet such criticism by establishing a policy as outlined above to utilize civilian personnel in all positions possible in order to release for strictly military duties all uniformed personnel. Under the revised estimates it is now expected that \$1,403,710,621 will be required to pay civilian personnel (both white and blue collar workers) employed in activities for the Department of the Army.

EXPEDITING PRODUCTION

The request for appropriation for expediting production in the amount of \$1,100,000,000 is based upon the need for additional production facilities to provide sufficient production capacity to meet current procurement objectives and to provide a production base which could be rapidly expanded. The program was inaugurated during fiscal year 1951 from appropriated funds in the amount of \$1,100,000,000 and the funds requested herein are to continue the program for increased productive capacity required to supplement current and foreseeable Army needs and those needs of the Navy and Air Force for which the Army has procurement responsibility, and at the same time broaden the mobilization base. The funds will be used for the limited purchase of land, conversion, construction, rehabilitation or expansion of facilities and purchase and installation of production equipment in both Government and privately-owned plants necessary to support the program. The committee was advised that the use of these funds will be held to a minimum consistent with the objectives to be attained both as to military preparedness and maintenance of civilian item production with the minimum possible degree of interference. The funds are placed under the control of the Secretary of the Army to enable him to meet emergent conditions and to provide for changing requirements based on combat experience, need for rapid production capacity due to newly developed and proven items, need for improving design of existing equipment and similar conditions which prevent firm determination of facility requirements in advance as is necessary in the unusual procedures and rapid developments. Approximately $\frac{1}{3}$ of the funds requested herein are required and will be used in support of the Navy and Air Force, particularly in the fields of small arms, artillery, trucks, tanks, and bombs which the Army procures or manufactures for the three Services.

The committee recommends a reduction of \$100,000,000, leaving a balance of \$1 billion to perform the activities necessary in the program

and directs that a reevaluation of the program be made. When the department again reports to the committee, the latest information concerning the needs of this program should be presented. The committee feels that every effort should be made to effect economies without injury to the program and is providing herewith a rather large amount for the program. If it is found impossible to effect the suggested saving, the matter can be again considered by the Congress later in the year.

FIELD EXERCISES

The appropriation request for field exercises in the amount of \$16,000,000 is to provide for the conduct of exercise prescribed by the Department of the Army, or the Chief of Army Field Forces, and transcending Army area boundaries as distinguished from local exercises conducted by Army and overseas commanders in the performance of their training mission. Field exercises are the culmination of the training cycle, following as they do the completion of basic training conducted in replacement training centers, advanced individual training conducted in service schools and units, and unit and combined branch training. For fiscal year 1952 five large scale exercises are programed, two in the southeastern part of the Nation, one in New York State, one in Texas, and the other location not as yet determined. The major requirements for funds for field exercises are for moving units from their home station to firing ranges for field firing exercises, and for packing and crating and miscellaneous expenses involved in testing the ability of general reserve units to quickly and efficiently prepare for movements to ports of embarkation when alerted for overseas shipment. \$205,000 of the amount requested is estimated as needed for the acquisition of maneuver rights in areas needed for field exercises; and \$2,500,000 for the conduct of local exercises in Army areas and overseas commands.

FINANCE SERVICE, ARMY

The request for funds for fiscal year 1952 for finance service, Army, totals \$3,610,848,000; of which \$3,308,425,000 is for Pay of the Army; \$254,000,000 for travel of the Army; and \$48,423,000 for finance service of the Army. Under Pay of the Army provision is made for pay and allowances of all military personnel on extended active duty who are engaged in Army activities, as well as pay and commuted rations of cadets at the United States Military Academy. Provision is also made for the payment of interest on soldiers' deposits; expenses of military ports and commission; expenses incident to the apprehension of deserters; and the payment of authorized donations to discharged prisoners. The estimated average strength of the Army for fiscal year 1952 is 1,531,200 man years, which represents an average strength greater than that for fiscal year 1951 by approximately 442,000 man years. The average strength will consist of 120,600 commissioned officers, 14,700 warrant officers, 8,300 nurses and women's medical specialist corps, 1,385,200 enlisted personnel, and 2,400 cadets at the United States Military Academy.

The committee recommends a reduction in the amount requested for Pay of the Army of \$6,349,000 for the reason that it was indicated the estimated strength of the military forces as of July 1, 1951, was

less than anticipated, although it is expected that through Selective Service and voluntary enlistments the anticipated strength will be attained. In addition, the committee action envisages the reduction of the number of civilian employees requested by approximately 2,000 man years, a dollar reduction for this purpose of \$5,000,000. It is not the purpose of the committee to reduce in any way the number of military personnel requested, but, as the number anticipated was not on board at the beginning of the fiscal year, there will be some lapses. It may be found possible to effect economies in other items budgeted for under this head sufficient to amount to the \$6,349,000 withheld by the committee without in any way hurting the program.

The sub appropriation, Travel of the Army, for which \$254,000,000 is budgeted, is to provide for travel incident to the maintenance of occupation forces and oversea garrisons, and to the training and development of the general reserve units and supporting troops within the zone of the interior. The request includes funds also for temporary duty travel to be performed in connection with administrative and operational activities of the Department of the Army; travel expenses for individuals or groups attending schools of less than five months' duration where permanent change of station is not authorized. The committee was advised that through redeployment of units and an increase rotation of individuals in the Far East Command, travel incident to the induction, training and deployment contemplated in the expanded troop program, will result in substantial increases of travel expenditures during fiscal year 1952 over those required during fiscal year 1951. For example, it is anticipated that approximately 630,000 individuals will be released from active duty during fiscal year 1952 and will, upon release from active duty, require travel pay to their homes.

The committee recommends a reduction of \$9,000,000 in the request for travel funds on the basis that the need for travel is not sufficiently policed and that reductions can be made if better management is applied to the expenditure of these funds.

The sub appropriation, Finance Service, for which \$48,423,000 is budgeted is to provide funds for the administration, supervision, and operation of finance corps functions at Army headquarters and in class 1 and class 2 installations. These functions include budget, fiscal, and cost accounting activities at class 1 installations, and the paying of all military and civilian personnel and commercial accounts. The major portion of the funds are for personnel at class 2 installations of the Chief of Finance, including the Army Finance Center where the work load due to increase in troop strength will be greatly increased, United States Army Regional Accounts Offices, and the various finance offices, United States Army, in the United States and overseas. A large portion of the field employees under this activity are engaged in the audit of industrial, research, and construction contracts of the Department of Defense for the purpose of verifying costs under cost reimbursement contracts and of making renegotiation studies of fixed-price contracts; auditing all military property and sales accounts, industrial property accounts, receipts and disbursements of the Alaskan Communication System and of the American National Red Cross, and other miscellaneous accounts.

WELFARE OF ENLISTED MEN

The purpose of this appropriation for which \$20,000,000 is requested is to stimulate, develop, and maintain the mental and physical well being of military personnel through voluntary participation in planned leisure-time sports, entertainment, and recreational activities; to provide the enlisted personnel of the Army with the athletic and recreational supplies and equipment needed to carry out a well-rounded program of off-duty recreation; and to provide personnel and facilities as well as supplies, material, and equipment not otherwise provided in tables of organization and equipment, tables of allowances, or by the Army agencies, necessary for the promotion of individual or mass participation in all phases of the recreational program in all echelons of command. The average number of employees to be paid from this appropriation is anticipated to be 2,825, reflecting an increase of 675 man years over the personnel requirements for fiscal year 1951. This however reflects an increase of only 81 positions above the positions required in fiscal year 1951. A portion of the personnel used in the operation of this program is provided from non appropriated funds. The increase herein reflected over the funds provided in fiscal year 1951 is \$1,073,500.

SUBSISTENCE OF THE ARMY

The appropriation request, subsistence of the Army, for which \$603,309,000 is requested is divided into four projects, of which project 111 for Provisions and Ration Savings is the largest, \$568,-704,000. Funds in this project are to provide for the purchase of subsistence supplies for the Army and Air Force to be issued as rations to enlisted personnel, and to civilian employees whose contracts of employment provide for subsistence at government expense; for service contracts for packing subsistence for export; for reimbursement to the Navy and Marine Corps for meals furnished Army enlisted personnel; for payment to hospitals and other organizations, subsisted under the garrison ration system of savings on ration and savings accounts maintained by Army commissaries; for the purchase of items authorized to provide as subsistence supplies for resale. The estimate in this project is based on a ration cost of \$1.0938 per day per person for the Zone of the Interior and \$1.2968 for overseas commands. It includes also operational type rations commonly known as "C rations" estimated at a cost of \$2.15 each and "five-in-one" ration at a cost of \$1.85 each and "assault" ration at \$.62 each.

Project 112, Commissary Equipment, for which \$220,000 is requested, is for the purchase of authorized commissary equipment consisting of cash registers, coffee grinders, refrigerated meat and dairy display cases, produce cases, frozen food cabinets, price tags, price tag holders, and cash register tapes. The amount requested will provide also an average of \$1,000 per commissary for the replacement of equipment worn out through fair wear and tear, and an average of \$100 per commissary for expendable supplies for 75 commissaries in the continental United States and 125 overseas.

Project 411, Commutation of Rations, for which \$24,385,000 is requested, is for payment of commutation of rations to enlisted personnel not in a travel status when on detached service or recruiting duties; for furnishing meals under contracts for enlisted personnel on recruiting duty, and to recruits and applicants for enlistment.

Project 412, Care and Preservation of Subsistence, for which \$10,000,000 is requested, is for the purchase of ice for preservation of subsistence supplies, for issue to organizations of enlisted men, and for cooling drinking water for military and civilian personnel; for the purchase of dry ice for preservation and storage of biologicals; for service contracts executed by quartermaster class 2 installations for commercial cold storage of perishable subsistence supplies; for miscellaneous expenses required for the care, preservation, and reconditioning of subsistence supplies; for roasting coffee by contract; for prizes for graduate bakers and cooks, when authorized; for paper supplies and utensils for serving troop train rations.

REGULAR SUPPLIES OF THE ARMY

The request for appropriation for regular supplies of the Army, for which \$485,351,000 is requested is divided into thirteen projects which cover a broad range of activities including the procurement of sanitary supplies and equipment, cooking and mess equipment, furniture for commissioned and noncommissioned officers' quarters, miscellaneous general supplies and equipment, office supplies, warehouse equipment, special quartermaster equipment, supplies for handling liquid fuels and lubricants, field training activities, packing and crating, and numerous other supplies and services.

Project 120, Industrial Mobilization Planning, for which \$2,668,000 is requested is to provide industrial preparedness studies and industrial mobilization planning as directed by the Munitions Board. Of the amount requested \$1,274,397 is required to provide 241 man years of employment for the services of employees required to accomplish the quartermaster industrial mobilization planning during the fiscal year. Employees will be located in offices at New York, Chicago, Atlanta, Boston, Philadelphia, Oakland, and Jeffersonville. \$229,060 will be required for travel essential to the accomplishment of this activity; \$17,443 for the purchase of equipment necessary for the proper display of items of Quartermaster Corps supply in the aid sample and display rooms maintained and operated in connection with the production allocation activities of the Quartermaster industrial mobilization offices located throughout the United States; and \$1,147,100 to acquire and retain a reserve of industrial production equipment; to provide for the necessary preservation, reconditioning, rehabilitation, modification and modernization of tools in the reserve; and for the purchase of special supplies and materials essential for the maintenance and operation of sample and display rooms.

Project 121, Animals, for which \$465,000 is requested is for the purchase of horses, mules and dogs required in connection with Army training and other activities; for the purchase of bedding and forage for animals; for expenses incident to raising and harvesting forage on military reservations, including the cost of irrigation, when specifically authorized by the Secretary of the Army; for the purchase of special supplies and equipment required in the use of training of dogs; for the purchase of supplies and equipment including spare parts when purchased with the end item or for depot stock, for use in connection with animal transportation activities. It is estimated there will be required of this amount \$360,007 for feeding an average of 216 horses; 664 mules; and 888 dogs. It is estimated there will be a requirement for the purchase of 32 horses; 99 mules; and 30 dogs during the

fiscal year 1952. Horses and mules are used for different purposes such as for mounted police, funeral caissons, policing of grounds, draft work and similar activities.

Project 123, Office Supplies, for which \$56,318,000 is requested is for the purchase of stationery and sundry office supplies; office machines, furniture and filing equipment; rental of office equipment and machines, including electric accounting machines and posting machines and meters. Of this amount \$2,273,206 is requested for mobilization reserve material requirements.

Project 124, Other Regular Supplies, for which \$127,938,000 is requested is for the purchase of sanitary supplies and equipment, of cooking and mess equipment, and of miscellaneous general supplies and equipment authorized by tables of allowances, tables of equipment, tables of organization and equipment, or specifically authorized by the Quartermaster General to be supplied to tactical organizations and to posts, camps and stations as quartermaster property; and for the purchase of furniture for officers' and noncommissioned officers' quarters. \$43,914,301 is carried in this request for mobilization reserve material requirements.

Project 125, Warehouse Equipment, for which \$3,844,000 is requested, is for the purchase of miscellaneous warehouse equipment (other than materials handling equipment), including spare parts when purchased with end items, or for depot stocks, dunnage, prefabricated bins and shelving; and for pallets and equipment for packing and crating, when specifically authorized by the Quartermaster General.

Project 126, Fixed Bakery Equipment, for which \$286,000 is requested is for the purchase of fixed bakery equipment for post bakeries, except for new construction, which is unauthorized by the Quartermaster General. Requirements for this type of equipment are based on a thirteen year life.

Project 127, Special Quartermaster Equipment, for which \$60,193,000 is requested, is for the purchase of materials handling equipment and special purpose equipment, for the purchase of spare parts for materials handling equipment and special purpose equipment; and for local purchase of repair parts when required for maintenance and repair of materials handling equipment. Of the total amount requested \$25,001,155 is included for mobilization reserve material requirements.

Project 128, Supplies for Handling Liquid Fuels and Lubricants, for which \$73,012,000 is requested, is for the purchase of containers, supplies and equipment for handling liquid fuels and lubricants including laboratory equipment. Of the amount requested \$53,964,750 is requested for mobilization reserve material requirements.

Project 129, Liquid Fuels and Lubricants, for which \$105,913,000 is requested, is for the purchase of liquid fuels and lubricants, ground and air, for the Department of the Army and for contractual services for handling liquid fuels and lubricants; and for drumming operations in the continental United States and in overseas commands including \$13,811,000 for mobilization reserve purposes.

Project 421, Field Printing Plants, for which \$6,330,000 is requested, is for the procurement of contractual services, supplies and equipment, and the purchase of items constituting contract printing and reproduction procured from commercial sources, including all stenographers' books and other articles in book form which require printing, reproduction or ruling operations for their manufacture, and any items which require any printing and binding operations after receipt

of the order by the vendor to fit it for the particular needs of the government.

Project 424, Packing and Crating, for which \$46,000,000 is requested, is for the purchase of those standard items required for packing and crating activities for which fund responsibility has been specifically assigned to the Quartermaster Corps; for purchase of supplies and contractual services for packing and crating Quartermaster property (except contractual services for export packing of subsistence) at Quartermaster depots, Quartermaster sections of general depots (including overseas supply points), Adjutant General depots and Adjutant General supply sections of general depots, and for contracting with commercial sources for emergency packing and crating of Quartermaster items, including labor and material in the United States.

Project 425, Special Quartermaster Supplies and Services, for which \$2,000,000 is requested, is for the payment of contractual service not otherwise provided for; for the purchase of reference books, periodicals, and trade publications incident to the Quartermaster Corps activities; law books for field Judge Advocates when specifically authorized; and for the purchase of safety publications and materials incident to the safety program.

Project 521, Quartermaster Corps Training Activities, for which \$384,000 is requested, is for the purchase of special supplies and equipment and for the payment of contractual service required in connection with military and civilian training activities. The intensification and acceleration of training occasioned by the Korean situation has resulted in an increase in and speed up of the requirements for all types of training supplies, equipment, and materials, such as training film, field and technical manuals, training aids and devices, Army wide.

The committee recommends an over-all reduction of \$20,351,000 in this request for appropriation because of the necessity for greater economy in procurement of items such as office furniture, various types of equipment and supplies and through the reduction of a number of personnel.

CLOTHING AND EQUIPAGE

The requested appropriation for "Clothing and Equipage" in the amount of \$1,647,681,000 is to provide for the purchase of personal and organizational clothing and equipment, barrack equipment, and toilet articles. The estimate also provides for payment of clothing allowances due enlisted men, the purchase of citizens' outer clothing to be issued to soldiers discharged other than honorably, and barbers' and tailors' supplies for use of general prisoners confined at military posts without pay and allowances. The request covers also funds for maintenance, alteration, and reclamation of Quartermaster property; salvage activities of the Army; depot maintenance of materials handling equipment of the Army and Air Force; and the operation of laundries and dry-cleaning plants.

Request was contained in the estimates for the sum of \$1,130,000,000 to be transferred to and for the setting up of a stock fund for the Clothing and Equipage Division. Approximately \$1,000,000,000 of this amount is to provide for Mobilization Reserve Material Requirement, Wool Reserve, and a Duck and Webbing Pool. It is the purpose of the committee to recommend this amount for the procurement

of these requirements but to recommend a reduction of \$130,000,000 in the request on the basis that no Army stock fund program be inaugurated. In keeping with this action appropriate language has been incorporated in the text of the bill to prevent the use of any of the fund being transferred to any working capital fund. In addition it is the purpose of the committee to prevent the capitalization of any stocks on hand, or any stocks procured in the future from appropriated funds being utilized as working capital funds unless based on specific appropriations by the Congress for that purpose.

In addition to the above the committee recommends a further reduction in this item of appropriation in the amount of \$11,000,000 to be applied against the requested requirement for civilian personnel, leaving for the appropriation \$1,506,681,000.

A detailed discussion of the items covered under this appropriation and the requests by projects follows:

Project 131, Purchase of Clothing and Equipage, for which \$413,-108,000 is requested, is to provide for the purchase and manufacture of items of clothing, estimated at approximately \$365,000,000, and equipage estimated at approximately \$133,000,000, and for the purchase of citizens' clothing to be issued to soldiers discharged other than honorably.

Project 432, Quartermaster Maintenance, Alteration, Salvage and Reclamation Activities, for which \$72,000,000 is required, is for the purpose of maintenance, alteration, and reclamation of Quartermaster property; salvage activity of the Army; and depot maintenance of materials handling equipment for the Department of the Army and the Air Force. An increase of \$14,203,571 is requested for increased personnel service, increasing the man years required for the operation of this project by 6,282, from 7,633 in fiscal year 1951 to 13,915 man years for fiscal year 1952. It is estimated that the increased requirement for personnel will be needed for maintenance, salvage and reclamation, and contractual service to reclaim the anticipated roll up of repairable items generated by the Korean operations. This request is based upon lessons learned from the period subsequent to World War II when millions of items were not reclaimed because of the lack of repair facilities.

Project 433, Operation of Quartermaster Laundries and Dry Cleaning Plants, for which \$32,573,000 is requested, is to provide laundry and dry cleaning service to meet the requirements of the Department of the Army. It is based on the operation of 138 laundries and 84 dry cleaning plants of which 59 laundries and 17 dry cleaning plants are in the continental United States. The increase of slightly over \$10,000,000 over fiscal year 1951 is occasioned by the augmentation of the Army, resulting in increased work load in existing facilities; the opening of 9 new laundries and 1 dry cleaning plant in the continental United States; the construction of 15 new laundries and 17 dry cleaning plants overseas; and the expansion of 3 existing laundries overseas. It is estimated the increased work load will require additional personnel to the extent of 2,371 man years of employment.

INCIDENTAL EXPENSES OF THE ARMY

The appropriation, Incidental Expenses of the Army, for which \$198,914,000 is requested is to provide the operating personnel for the

Quartermaster service; disposition of remains; incidental operating expenses; chaplains' activities; recruiting expenses; education of dependents; and research and development. The requested appropriation represents an increase of \$26,679,000 over the funds required for the same operations fiscal year 1951. The major item of increase is for personnel required in the operation of Quartermaster depots, general depots, purchasing offices, training centers and Quartermaster activities in posts, camps and stations throughout the world. An increase of approximately \$12,000,000 in depot personnel is due to the fact that tremendously large quantities of supplies and equipment procured from fiscal year 1951 funds will be delivered during fiscal year 1952 and the additional personnel will be needed to permit proper handling to prevent deterioration of supplies the value of which is many times greater than the cost of handling. An increase of approximately \$8,000,000 in the Army areas of the United States is due to the activation of additional stations in the latter part of 1951 and the increase in population of existing stations. The increase of approximately \$10,000,000 in overseas commands is principally for the European command and is caused by the build up of troops in that area. Some decreases have been made in other sub-appropriations under this activity accounting for the increase of only \$26,679,000 contained in this request.

The committee recommends reduction in this appropriation in the over-all amount of \$11,000,000, the major portion of which, or approximately \$9,000,000 to be applied against civilian personnel. The additional reduction of \$2,000,000 has been made with the thought that greater economy in operation could be achieved and that this amount can be saved through better management.

Project 441, Quartermaster Operating Personnel, for which \$160,390,000 is budgeted is to provide for the payment of civilian employees engaged in performing Quartermaster functions and in the operation of installations under the jurisdiction of the Quartermaster General. These personnel are required to procure, inspect, receive, store and issue food, clothing, fuels and lubricants, and Quartermaster items of equipment; conduct Quartermaster training; receive, store, maintain, and issue other technical service supplies and equipment through the general depot systems; administer and provide common services in depots, purchasing offices, market centers, training centers, for support of troops serving in the Army, Navy and Air Force.

Project 443, Disposition of Remains, for which \$6,417,000 is requested, is for the purpose of providing burial expenses of military and civilian personnel of the Department of the Army; prisoners and other persons who may die in the Army custody similar to prisoners of war; embalming services; mortuary supplies; and contractual services in connection with interment, disinterment and handling of remains in the Far East Command.

Project 445, Incidental Operating Expenses, for which \$1,134,000 is requested, is for the purchase of postage stamps, except for parcel post, all first-class mail of the Army, when required, and for the rental of post office properties when authorized; miscellaneous expenses properly chargeable to appropriated funds and not otherwise provided for when specifically authorized by the Quartermaster General. Postage is required on all mail matter to and from foreign countries except Canada, Cuba, Mexico, and Panama, and for inter-

county communications outside the United States. Postage is also required by Finance Officers in registering mail matter containing accounts and official checks and by quartermasters in registering mail matter containing valuable instruments. Funds are also included in this project for the testing of materials and supplies by the Bureau of Standards.

Project 447, Chaplain's Activities, for which \$869,000 is requested, is for the procurement of necessary chapel equipment and religious supplies, such as altar covers, communion sets, crosses, music and prayer books.

Project 448, Recruiting Expenses, for which \$10,000,000 is requested, is to provide for advertising and miscellaneous expenses in connection with recruiting activities, including the payment of civilian personnel at recruiting stations and the cost of special supplies and services for the Army and Air Force recruiting service and the recruiting publicity bureau. Of the amount requested \$5,950,000 is for personal expenses for the payment of civilian personnel to a number of 1,985 man years for fiscal year 1952 as compared to 2,670 required for fiscal year 1951. It is the purpose of the service to use civilian employees wherever it is possible rather than employing military personnel for this work. The next largest item of request under this program is for other contractual services for which \$3,564,000 is requested. These funds are used for payment of national advertising to obtain as many volunteer enlistments as possible. Continued emphasis is being placed on recruiting to obtain volunteers and thereby reduce the number to be called under selective service. Other contractual services consist of repair of machines, recruiting signs, sound equipment, displays and the construction of displays and exhibits and other miscellaneous services required for the recruiting program.

Project 544, Education of Dependents, for which \$4,800,000 is requested, is to provide for the expenses of primary and secondary schooling for an estimated 24,000 dependents of military and civilian personnel of the Department of Defense residing outside the United States when it is determined that schools, if any, available in the locality are unable to provide adequately for the education of such dependents. The program will provide for 966 man years of employment for fiscal year 1952 as compared to 667 man years for fiscal year 1951. The program provides for 476 administrative, supervisory and teaching personnel required for the operation of 60 elementary and 8 high schools in Germany; 22 personnel for the operation of elementary schools in France; 42 personnel for the operation of 5 elementary schools and 1 high school in Austria; 380 personnel required for the operation of 36 elementary and 12 high schools for Japan; for 19 personnel for the operation of 1 elementary school and 1 high school for Okinawa; for 10 personnel for the operation of 2 elementary schools and 1 high school for Trieste; for 7 personnel for the operation of a school through grades 1 to 12 inclusive for Greece; and for 10 personnel for the operation of a school, grades 1 through 12 inclusive for Turkey. For other contractual services \$704,000 is budgeted to provide for tuition fees for 3,000 Department of the Army dependents in Panama and 520 Department of the Army dependents residing in foreign countries, the latter dependents being children of Department of the Army military attaches, mission groups, and other Department of the Army personnel residing in Central and South America, Belgium, Portugal, Italy, Iran, Eritrea, Canada and other foreign countries.

TRANSPORTATION SERVICE, ARMY

The appropriation "Transportation Service, Army," for which \$978,515,000 is requested provides for the movement of persons and cargo under policies fixed by the Department of Defense. The funds requested are to be used in support of military activities world-wide for the movement of freight by commercial means, except movements from vendors to first point of storage or use; ocean transportation service furnished by the Military Sea Transportation Service; operation and organizational maintenance of administrative motor vehicles; operation, maintenance, and repair of military railway equipment and floating equipment; port and depot operations; training; research and development; industrial mobilization and procurement planning; procurement of marine and railway equipment; and for other necessary expenses in performing assigned transportation missions. Approximately two-thirds of the funds requested are not subject to control by the Transportation Service. That is, the tonnage given to the Transportation Service for movement and the rates to be paid for the movement of such tonnage are controlled by other agencies of the Government. This is strictly a service organization. Funds requested herein do not include the ocean transportation of Air Force property and passengers as in prior years, but do provide for the Army Technical Service support of the Air Forces overseas.

The committee recommends a reduction of \$10,000,000 in this request with the thought that by greater conservation of civilian personnel and more efficient operation no injury will be done to the operation of the Transportation Service.

Project 110, Industrial Mobilization and Procurement Planning, for which \$332,320 is requested, is to cover the Transportation Corps' participation in the overall industrial mobilization plan and related activities and is required for the storage of war reserve machine tools; for determination of war time requirements for raw and semi-processed basic materials and production equipment; for selection of facilities to be utilized to produce equipment assigned to the Transportation Corps for procurement in time of emergency, and for the scheduling of production to meet phased requirements in the facilities selected; to analyze, review, and keep current bills of materials and specifications in conjunction with new developments in equipment, materials and production processes, changes in requirements, changes in industrial processes and changes in the strategic and mobilization plans of the Department of Defense.

Project 120, Procurement of Marine, Railway, and Materials Handling Equipment, for which \$235,303,000 is requested, is to provide funds for the procurement of transportation equipment and instruction services, travel and first destination transportation pertaining thereto. \$230,049,000 of this amount is for the procurement of floating equipment to be assigned to units; installations and commands under Transportation, Army, authorization; and for items for a limited mobilization reserve.

Project 410, Movements Services, for which \$19,126,080 is requested, is to cover the expenses of traffic management activities and other activities relating to commercial transportation, including personal services and contractual services for planning, analysis, and control of Army-wide commercial transportation of persons and things. It covers such items as pay of civilian personnel, transportation sections

of headquarters, major command headquarters (except Departmental) and in posts, camps, and stations, and cost of contractual services required to plan, control, and analyze Army-wide movements programs; pay of personnel to negotiate and arrange for movements with carriers; cost of freight handling services obtained under contract or by direct hire; cost of accessorial services such as switching, drayage, ferriage, lighterage, terminal storage and demurrage when accrual of demurrage is attributable to the Army. The increase in the request of \$1,127,247 over the funds provided for fiscal year 1951 is due to the movement of personnel required for additional installation, expanded activities, and for replacement of military personnel with civilians; and increases in contractual services in Army areas and in the European Command.

Project 420, Commercial Transportation, Except Ocean, for which \$292,190,000 is requested, is to provide for the shipment of property to or from any Army installation when shipment is for the benefit of the Army, and for expenses of inter-depot movement of supplies which are used ultimately in support of the Air Force, and certain movements in support of the Air Force overseas; for procurement of commercial transportation; for costs of combination of land and water shipments when movement is made on a through bill of lading; for costs of commercial line haul transportation and for accessorial services which are immediately incident to the line haul, including the cost of in transit refrigeration, diversion, and tolls. This project contains funds for transportation required by all the technical services.

Project 445, Ocean Transportation Service, for which \$229,116,000 is requested, is to provide funds for ocean transportation service performed by the Military Sea Transportation Service for military support activities of the Department of Defense. Fund requirements are based on workload data developed by the Department of the Army and cost estimates compiled by the Military Sea Transportation Service. The decrease in the request of \$138,772,521 from the funds provided under this project for fiscal year 1951 is due to the fact that ocean transportation of the Air Force for personnel and property as formerly estimated under this project will be requested in the appropriation Maintenance and Operation, Department of the Air Force.

Project 450, Highway Transport Service, for which \$44,245,000 is requested, is to provide funds for pay of civilian personnel engaged in the administration, operation and organizational maintenance of administrative vehicles operated for military activities and functions; and for certain contractual bus operations.

Project 460, Military Railway Service, for which \$17,812,000 is requested is to cover the direction, administration, operation, maintenance and repair of military railway equipment used for military activities; and base and field maintenance to the medium of the base railroad repair shops and mobile repair shops, for the U. S. Air Force; also the costs of contractual railway services in overseas commands for the movement of personnel and cargo.

Project 480, Operation and Repair of Floating Equipment, for which \$29,700,000 is requested, is to provide for the operation and repair of floating equipment used by the Army at ports of embarkation, and for floating equipment assigned to installations under the direct supervision of Army commanders for the movement of cargo and personnel, etc.

Project 490, Operation of Field Installations, for which \$100,000,000 is requested, is to cover the operation of ports and sub-installations thereof, the operation of Transportation Corps depots, operation of personnel centers, expenses for other than training activities at the transportation training center, and the operation of the transportation research and development station. The four ports of embarkation operated within the Zone of the Interior receive, prepare for shipment, warehouse supplies, material, equipment, and process personnel en route overseas; operate piers and dock facilities, supervise the loading and unloading of cargo vessels at Army owned or operated piers; control traffic between the port and overseas destinations, and edit requisitions from overseas and set up and expedite shipments resulting therefrom.

Project 561, Education and Training, for which \$2,602,000 is requested, is to provide funds for the education and training program designed to accomplish a high state of technical training and readiness for employment in the Transportation Corps of units of the general reserve under the command of the Chief of Transportation. This program covers such diversified fields as railway, highway and marine transportation, pipe lines and the movement of cargo by aircraft.

Project 565, Operation of Transportation School, for which \$1,828,000 is requested, is to provide the Transportation Corps with officers, warrant officers and enlisted personnel of the Regular Army and civilian components who are properly trained in the basic requirements of the soldier as well as in the many technical fields of transportation, including motor, marine, railway, movements control and cargo movements by aircraft, etc. Individual training is accomplished through the medium of resident courses, extension courses and the issuance of field and training manuals. Resident courses include advanced and basic courses, specialized courses in highway transport and harbor craft and courses in such fields as automotive, locomotive and marine mechanics, marine engineers, riggers and boilermarkers. The increase request of approximately \$388,000 over the funds required under this project for fiscal year 1951 is due primarily to the replacement of military personnel with civilian and to meet increased requirements at the transportation school in both resident and non-resident activities.

SIGNAL SERVICE OF THE ARMY

The request for appropriation for "Signal Service of the Army" for fiscal year 1952 is \$1,243,707,000 which reflects an increase of \$67,629,840 over the funds required for that activity during fiscal year 1951. For convenience of consideration and presentation the activities of the Signal Corps are divided into 12 projects the first of which is:

Project 110, Industrial Mobilization Planning, for which \$14,569,000 is requested. Under this project provision is made for preservation of reserve tools, contracts for industry preparedness measures, cataloging, standardization of supplies and equipment, and mobilization requirements planning as directed by the Munitions Board. The average number of employees under this program during fiscal year 1951 was 507. To perform the activity during fiscal year 1952 627 average number of employees is requested. This reflects a total number of permanent positions of 650 which is the number utilized in this program at the end of fiscal year 1951. There is an increase of

approximately \$3,000,000 under this program for contractual service which is required to get industry to make small militarization component parts of new equipment and things needed in the military that have no place in the civilian economy.

Project 120, Procurement of Organizational Supplies and Equipment, for which \$944,616,000 is requested, reflects an increase of approximately \$22,000,000 over the funds provided for fiscal year 1951. This program covers the procurement of all signal material for organizational units in the Army, first-destination transportation costs of such material, and pay and travel of civilian personnel engaged in procurement, production engineering, and inspection, and contains the major portion of the funds required for the signal service activities. The increase requested is due to accelerated service testing of new equipment and the equipping of certain tactical units in the Army. There is a major increase in the request for personal services from \$11,633,000 in fiscal year 1951 to \$27,500,000 in fiscal year 1952 and from 2,694 average number of employees to 6,376. The committee was advised that the need for increased personnel was due to the increased procurement and inspection of some \$776,000,000 worth of equipment. A major portion of the materials contracted for during fiscal year 1951 are now in process of being produced and require additional inspectors so that the programs may not be delayed. Additional inspectors will be required for the procurement of materials from funds provided during fiscal year 1952. Increase in the item of transportation of things from \$2.5 million to \$10.5 million round figures is brought about by the fact that the estimated value of shipments during 1951 is \$130,000,000 and that during fiscal year 1952 the value of items to be transported will be approximately \$645,000,000.

Project 130, Radio and Radar for Army Boats, for which \$831,000 is requested, reflects a decrease of slightly over \$600,000. This program provides for the procurement, installation, and maintenance of radio and radar supplies and equipment on Army vessels throughout the world, the cost of such equipment being based on the life expectancy of various replaceable parts such as vacuum tubes, resistors, transformers, etc. The decrease in the request for 1952 is occasioned by a smaller number of vessels to be equipped, the anticipated number being 1,348 to be equipped from the funds provided herein.

Project 210, Construction of Fixed Wire Communication System, for which \$10,606,000 is requested, reflects a decrease over the funds provided for 1951 of \$7,636,836, the major decreases being in the procurement of supplies and materials, and equipment. This project provides for the construction and major rehabilitation of Army owned fixed wire communications systems.

Project 221, Construction of Radio Systems, for which \$21,521,000 is requested, is to provide for the maintenance of the global radio network to Germany, the Canal Zone, Alaska, Hawaii, Guam and the Far East. In other words from these funds is provided the administrative traffic, long distance communications, differentiating the administrative from tactical troop communications.

Project 310, Operation of Signal Corps Activities, for which \$120,106,000 is requested, is to provide for the operation of Signal Corps depots, repair shops, and supply control points and for civilian personnel engaged in maintaining signal supplies and equipment at Army posts, camps, and stations. The 1951 work load of 200,000

tons handled, 42,000 items repaired, and 64,000 tons reclassified compares with an estimated work load of 330,720 tons to be handled, 61,000 items to be repaired, and 65,000 tons to be reclassified in 1952. An overall increase of 8,062 employees will be required to perform the additional work load. Of the requested increase of \$39,000,000, \$25,000,000 is for the Signal Corps proper, \$9,700,000 for special field activity, \$2,100,000 to be used in Army areas, and \$2,200,000 in the overseas commands. The major portions of the funds in this project is for personnel services, the depot supply stores requiring 7,600 man years, depot maintenance 3,954 man years, and Signal Corps stock control agency 1,599 man years. It is estimated on a rather firm basis considering the experience through April of 1951 that 200,000 tons of material and equipment will be received, shipped, and handled during fiscal year 1951, and that the activities under this program will require the receiving, shipping, and handling of 330,000 tons during fiscal year 1952. Under the object classification, other contractual services, were an increase slightly in excess of \$100,000 is requested, is to provide for contractual service required to repair and service depot operating, reproduction, packing, and packaging equipment, and for repair of administrative equipment not provided for by other technical services. The object classification, supplies and materials, for which approximately \$4,000,000 increase is requested, is to provide for the procurement of lumber, canvas tarpaulins, cartons, protective barriers, and packing, packaging, and marketing supplies; repair parts, raw materials, miscellaneous office, administrative and janitorial supplies required for the operation of the Signal Corps system. Funds are also provided to initially start the new depot Tobyhanna, Pennsylvania. Under the object classification of equipment approximately \$4,000,000 increase over the funds required in 1951 is requested. These funds are to provide for the replacement of some existing and some additional packaging, test, conveyor, processing, office marking, and depot operating equipment such as steel wire mesh pallets, containers, steel bins, shelving, steel storage racks, tote boxes, stencil machines, carton fabricating equipment, high speed paper cutting machines, semiautomatic steel strapping machines, and in general, to provide a streamlined, engineered production line processing of signal supplies to using units by the acquisition of urgently required labor saving operating equipment. Funds are included also for the complete equipping of the new depot at Tobyhanna, Pennsylvania with new operating packaging and test equipment.

Project 410, Maintenance and Operation of Fixed Wire Communication Systems, for which \$21,505,000 is requested, reflects only a slight increase over the funds provided for fiscal year 1951 and is to cover the operation, maintenance, and repair of army owned fixed wire communication systems.

Project 421, Maintenance and Operation of Radio Systems, for which \$4,190,000 is requested, reflects a slight increase over the funds provided in fiscal year 1951, and is to provide for the operation maintenance, and repair of Army owned fixed radio systems.

Project 440, Commercial Communications, for which \$17,000,000 is requested, reflects an increase of approximately \$100,000 over the funds provided for this purpose for fiscal year 1951, and is to cover the cost of commercial tolls for telephone, telegraph, and teletype services and for the rental of commercially owned communications equipment

leased by the Army. The increase of the \$100,000 is for the purpose of leasing additional commercial circuits, paying for teletypewriter exchange service, and cables where the government does not have its own facilities, and it is found cheaper to lease commercial lines than to provide additional facilities.

Project 460, Photographic Service, for which \$13,000,000 is requested reflects an increase of approximately \$500,000 over the funds provided for this purpose during fiscal year 1951, and covers the production, procurement, reproduction, distribution, and exhibition of still and motion picture training films, and for the operation and maintenance of the Army motion picture depository which receives and prepares for usage exposed motion picture films from army areas and overseas commands. A large portion of the \$5,579,913 requested for personal services which reflects an increase of \$466,438 over fiscal year 1951 is to provide training at the film studio, Long Island, New York. The other major activity under this project is the procurement of supplies and materials, for which \$6,329,511 is requested, a decrease of \$114,778 below fiscal year 1951, is to provide the raw stock for release prints for film libraries, and supplies and materials for still pictures.

Project 510, Education and Training, for which \$13,978,000 is requested, reflects an increase of approximately \$2,300,000 over the funds requested for fiscal year 1951, and is to provide for the operation of Signal Corps schools, procurement of training aids and supplies, and the production and distribution of training literature to the Army and civilian components of the Army. It is indicated that approximately 19,000 officers and enlisted men will be trained in fiscal year 1952, which reflects an increase of some 3,000 over the number trained in 1951. In order to handle the increased load it is proposed to open a new school at San Luis Obispo, California. The major portion of this request, \$12,899,333 is for the employment of civilian personnel at Fort Monmouth, New Jersey, Camp Gordon, Georgia, and at the installation to be activated at San Luis Obispo, California. It is the purpose of the Signal Corps to use civilian instructors, warehouse and maintenance employees rather than have that work done by uniformed soldiers.

After careful consideration of the requirements of the Signal Corps the committee recommends a reduction of \$30,000,000, of which \$15,000,000 is to be applied against estimated civilian personnel requirements, and the remaining \$15,000,000 against the procurement and production program. Testimony before the committee indicated that the Signal Corps had on the payroll as of June 30, 1951 37,884 civilian employees. The request contained in the budget estimated 49,509 man-years of civilian employment for fiscal year 1952, an increase of 11,625 over the ending strength for fiscal year 1951. The committee is aware of the heavier workload and the particular need for additional inspectors to keep abreast of the procurement program, but due to failure to recruit the personnel anticipated by June 30, 1951, the committee is of the opinion that with a more realistic program brought about by a rescheduling of proposed procurement deliveries and the exercise of careful management over civilian employment a reduction below the budget estimate of 3,000 man-years of civilian employment can be made without injury to the program.

ALASKA COMMUNICATION SYSTEM

The request for appropriation for "Operation and Maintenance of the Alaska Communication System" in the amount of \$4,176,000 reflects a decrease of slightly over \$3,000,000. It was pointed out that during fiscal year 1951 funds were provided for the construction of a telephone pole line and the fact that that project has been completed is the reason for the reduction in the amount of funds requested. The request contains funds for the employment of approximately ten more civilian employees to operate the repeater stations on the new telephone line from Anchorage to the Alcan Highway.

The Alaska Communication System has the mission of providing telegraph and telephone service to and from the territory of Alaska and between the cities and communities within Alaska. For the past few years the dollar value of military and commercial traffic handled over this system have increased from year to year, and it is anticipated that the dollar value of such traffic will reach \$5,640,000 in fiscal year 1952. The funds herein requested will provide for the procurement and moving of equipment into new buildings to be completed during the fiscal year; for emergency control and power equipment at the two largest installations; for the maintenance, repair and minor rehabilitation of communication facilities of the system including telephone, telegraph, cable, and radio systems; for the maintenance, repair, and alteration of buildings, grounds, walks, fences and utilities; and for expenses incident to operation of the Alaska Communication System exclusive of pay, allowances, subsistence, and medical care of military personnel.

CONSTRUCTION, ALASKA COMMUNICATION SYSTEM

The request for appropriation in the amount of \$1,400,000 for construction in Alaska is to provide for land and structures at 13 locations within the territory of Alaska. It will provide for such structures as a powerhouse at Kodiak; a transmitter and power building and two family quarters at Fairbanks; a transmitter and communications center building at Knoll; a communications center building at Koll Bay; a repeater and communication center building at Petersburg; a watch tower, powerhouse, at Seattle, Washington; a receiving building, power house, utilities, 2-car garage, a powerhouse, 1 maintenance garage, 1 very high frequency repeater building, and a security fence at Ketchikan; 2 family quarters, utilities, and a security fence at Juneau; a very high frequency repeater building, 4 family quarters, utilities, and a security fence at Lina Point; a transmitter building, a powerhouse, utilities, 1 receiver building, and a security fence at Cordova; a maintenance building at Portage; a very high frequency system from Juneau to Ketchikan; and a new powerhouse at Kotzebue.

MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL DEPARTMENT, ARMY

The request of the Army Medical Service for \$272,059,000 is to provide for medical and dental care of personnel of the Army, including the operation of general hospitals, station hospitals, and dispensaries throughout the world. In areas where facilities of the Department of the Navy, Department of the Air Force, and Veterans Administration are inadequate, their patients are cared for in Army hospitals on a reimbursable basis. Retired military personnel and

dependents of retired inactive military personnel are provided medical and hospital care at Army hospitals and dispensaries when facilities are available. This request does not include funds for civilian personnel, supplies, equipment, and services furnished by other technical branches of the Army for the maintenance and operation of health facilities; nor is the pay of military personnel included herein.

The above request is divided into eleven separate projects according to the purpose of the project. The first project, procurement of standard supplies and equipment, for which \$161,228,307 is budgeted, is to cover the cost of standard technical health supplies and equipment required by all Army facilities and tactical field units purchased, centrally, and in addition to military strength the fund requirements reflects the establishment of mobilization reserve of selected medical items, including 50 percent of the cost of the Department of Defense stockpile of blood plasma and shock solutions. Gross consumption and replacement requirements of individual items to be supplied under this appropriation are based on actual issue experience for the latest twelve months period related to the military strength proposed for fiscal year 1952. Initial issues are based on tables of organization and equipment and medical service equipment lists. The Army share of the blood plasma and blood plasma substitutes program is in the amount of \$13,660,000 carried in this program. The Department of the Navy and Air Force are to provide the remaining fifty percent of the program on an equal basis. The cost of procurement travel and of transportation from point of origin to point of first destination represents approximately 5 percent of the fund requirement for supplies and equipment combined.

Project 112, Procurement of Nonstandard Supplies and Equipment, for which \$9,283,592 is budgeted, is to cover the cost of providing nonstandard medical supplies and equipment, items which do not lend themselves to standardization because of their need for only specific purposes. Such items are special biologicals, special drugs, medical technical books and journals, and special treatment equipment. Estimated fund requirements for the procurement of nonstandard supplies and equipment during fiscal year 1952 are based on the actual obligations incurred during fiscal year 1950, adjusted in accordance with anticipated patient load for fiscal year 1952. Other requirements budgeted for under this project are a program to alter, equip and rehabilitate Army station hospitals so as to place them in first-class condition capable of treating all types of specialized treatment cases; to provide funds for overseas commands for which some requirements for supplies and equipment can be met from local sources such as X-ray film, biologicals, hospital furniture, native medical supplies necessary to provide medical care for prisoners of war and so forth. The project also provides for expenses in connection with examination of enlistees and inductees at approximately 108 main recruiting stations operating under the jurisdiction of Army and overseas commanders. The total number of gains to be accomplished through these recruiting stations is approximated at 449,000 for the Army and 282,720 for the Air Force at an approximate cost per gain of \$5.10. Payment of civilian doctors on a fee basis for examination of enlistees and inductees at recruiting stations is included in this project and utilization to a limited extent of civilian X-ray clinics and serology laboratories.

Project 414, Operation of Medical Centers and General Hospitals, for which \$16,688,000 is budgeted, provides for the cost, other than medical supplies and equipment, of operating general hospitals, convalescent annexes and Army medical centers in the zone of interior and at overseas commands. It is estimated that 5,529 man years of employment will be required to perform the duties under this project during the fiscal year 1952, which is an increase of 779.4 man years over the requirements for fiscal year 1951. The average salary under this project is \$2,903 per annum, making an overall total of \$15,309,-483 required for personal services. Of the amount requested, \$111,210 is budgeted for rents and utilities services which is to provide for identical sets of electric accounting equipment in nine zone of interior general hospitals and in Tripler Army Hospital, Territory of Hawaii; and \$4,513 is budgeted for contract field printing and reproduction for use in general hospitals, such as special labels and special forms. For other contractual services \$838,607 is budgeted to cover the cost of commercial repairs to Army medical service equipment utilized in general hospitals, such as sterilizers, X-ray machines, and physiotherapy apparatus.

Project 415, Operation of Station Hospitals, for which \$35,745,250 is requested, is to provide for the costs, other than medical supplies and equipment, of operating Army station hospitals in the zone of the interior and in overseas commands. It is estimated that 12,106 man years of employment will be required to operate this project, which is an increase of 5,724.6 man years over the comparable requirement for fiscal year 1951. For this purpose, \$35,025,819 is budgeted. The remainder of the request is for such items as printing and reproduction, and other contractual services.

Project 416, Operation of Other Medical Professional Services, for which \$16,163,101 is requested, covers the cost of operation, other than supplies and equipment, of dispensaries; first-aid stations; laboratories; the cost of hospitalization and medical care of authorized personnel in civilian medical facilities, and in the facilities of other government agencies; the cost of whole blood; the Army environmental health laboratories; the Armed Forces Institute of Pathology; the Army Medical Service Graduate School for its activities in the manufacture of vaccines and biologicals; provision for the Public Health Service program; and other related Army Medical Service activities. The facilities of several dental laboratories, medical laboratories, the Armed Forces Institute of Pathology, and the Army environmental health laboratory are provided the Air Force as a common service, and the Armed Forces Institute of Pathology provides service to the Department of the Navy as a common service. It is estimated that 3,249.6 man years of employment will be required for fiscal year 1952 which is an increase of 478 man years over the requirements of fiscal year 1951. The cost of this service is estimated at \$10,678,003 per annum. The increased requirement for civilian personnel is due to workload increases generated by the increase in the size of the Army and the medical care program. The other contractual services requires an estimated amount of \$4,972,920, which is to cover the cost of medical attendants for authorized personnel in facilities other than Army hospitals, blood and repairs to Army medical service equipment located in operating installations other than hospitals. The request is \$1,267,965 less than the requirement for fiscal year 1951, which is due principally to a decrease in utilization of Navy hospitals for Army

patients offset by increases in fund requirements for whole blood and for civilian medical and dental facilities due to increases in strength.

Project 421, Operation of Procurement Office, and Requirements and Stock Control Branch, Surgeon General's Office, for which \$1,685,000 is requested, is to provide funds for the operation of the Armed Services medical procurement agency and the requirements and stock control branch of the surgeon General's office. The responsibility of the Armed Services medical procurement agency is the establishment of joint specifications for medical materiel; compilation of joint catalog of medical materiel used by the Armed Services; the operation of a central catalog registry for medical materiel used not only by the Armed Services, but also by the United States Veteran Administration, and the U. S. Public Health Service; the procurement of all centrally purchased medical supplies for the Armed Services; and the responsibility for inspection of deliveries, contract terminations and settlements. Effective with fiscal year 1951 each department is required to provide for 33 and $\frac{1}{3}$ percent of the cost of the agency with the Department of the Army financing the initial expenditure and securing reimbursement from the other two departments. The functions of the requirements and stock control branch include the computation of quantities of items to be purchased for the Army and for mobilization plans; the computation of quantities of items to be purchased for the Air Force; the responsibility for stock control in Army medical supply depots; and activities in connection with the determination of availability of medical supplies for foreign assistance program and surpluses. The request for personal services under this project in the amount of \$1,388,838 is to cover the payment of 369.6 man years of service which is an increase of 106.2 man years over the requirements for fiscal year 1951. The average salary of the employee is \$3,757.68 per annum. Rents and utilities; printing and reproduction; other contractual services; supplies and materials; equipment; and taxes and assessments account for the balance of the request.

Project 422, Operation of Depots, for which \$13,608,000 is requested, is to provide for the cost of operation of Army medical service branch depots and medical sections of general depots in the zone of the interior, and medical depots and medical sections of general depots in overseas commands. The request for personal services which accounts for \$9,154,273 of the overall request for this project is to provide for 3,076.7 man-years of service, an increase of 1,006.1 man-years over the requirement for fiscal year 1951. The increase is based on the increased strength of the Army in overseas commands. \$3,221,306 is requested for the subitem of supplies and matériel to cover the cost for packing and crating of supplies and equipment for shipment to posts, camps, stations, and ports; repackaging of returned matériel when required for re-issue or for storage; repair and replacement of component parts of returned equipment where storage or re-issue is indicated; and repair and replacement of component parts of depot operating equipment such as sealing and strapping equipment.

Project 423, Industrial Mobilization Planning, for which \$84,000 is requested, is to cover the cost of operating expenses by the Armed Services medical procurement agency in connection with industrial mobilization and procurement planning.

Project 510, Education and Training, for which \$3,763,000 is requested, covers the cost of education and training activities at the medical field service schools, and the Army medical service replacement training center, Brook Army Medical Center, Fort Sam Houston, Texas, the Army medical service replacement training center, Fort George G. Meade, Maryland, and the Army Medical Service Graduate School, Army Medical Center, Washington, D. C., the direct costs of the operation of the Army Medical Library, Washington, D. C.; services from civilian sources for preparation of manuscript material for field and technical manuals and graphic training aids; teaching consultants at U. S. Army hospitals and schools; medical professional consultants at two Army commands; and the civilian institution training program. Utilization of the facilities of the medical field service school, the Army Medical Service Graduate School and the Army Medical Library are provided the Air Force as a common service. \$3,244,071 of the request is to provide 691.4 man years of employment, which is an increase of 91.4 man years over the requirements for fiscal year 1951. The remainder of the request is to provide such services as rents and utilities; printing and reproduction; other contractual services; supplies and materiel; equipment; and taxes and assessments.

The committee recommends a reduction of \$2,479,000 in this appropriation to be applied against civilian personnel requirements based upon the fact that as of June 30, 1951 there was on the payroll 24,030 civilian employees, some 6,000 less than the number of man-years of civilian employment budgeted for fiscal year 1952. The committee realizes the workload will require some build up, but the facts of record indicate a considerable build up of strength during the latter part of fiscal year 1951. The committee is of the opinion that a reduction of some 850 man-years of civilian employment will in no way prevent proper services or treatment to those requiring medical services or in the procurement of supplies and equipment to meet their needs.

ENGINEER SERVICE, ARMY

The appropriation for "Engineer Service, Army" for which \$1,201,049,000 is requested is divided into 11 projects as follows:

Project 110, Industrial Mobilization and Procurement Planning, for which \$4,171,000 is budgeted is to provide the Chief of Engineers' portion of the industrial mobilization and procurement planning program of the Munitions Board industrial mobilization, cataloging, and standardization programs. Of the amount requested for this project, \$2,499,000 is for planning for procurement from industry; \$1,026,000 is for the Munitions Board cataloging program; and \$646,000 is for the Munitions Board's standardization program. The fund requirements for fiscal year 1952 reflect a decrease of \$934,874 compared to the programs for fiscal year 1951. The 1951 procurement activities have resulted in the placement of production contracts for many items originally scheduled for production planning. As essential planning data is being developed in connection with these 1951 procurement contracts, the budget estimate for planning for procurement from industry reflects a reduction. The increase of \$41,000 for the cataloging program for fiscal year 1952 is requested for the completion of the development

phase and the initiation of the implementation phase of the cataloging program. An increase of \$146,000 in the request for the standardization program reflects an increased emphasis which has been placed on the program.

Project 120, Procurement of Engineers Military Supplies and Equipment, for which \$432,086,000 is requested, is to provide funds to cover the procurement of engineers supplies and equipment required for the support of troops and for the costs required in the planning and execution of the Corps of Engineers' procurement program. The project is divided into four programs, the first of which, Corps of Engineers and common service procurement costs is budgeted for \$22,779,000 to cover the complete cost of performing functions essential to the planning and execution of the Corps of Engineers procurement program. The costs of this program are primarily for personal services of civilian personnel engaged in (1) procurement, (2) inspection of materials, (3) expediting deliveries, (4) supply control, (5) cataloging, (6) administrative services. The Corps of Engineers is responsible for the purchase of engineer type items for the Air Force, Navy and other technical services, including the civilian components, which under the policy of single department and single service purchase responsibility creates a work load much greater than indicated by the funds requested. The engineers supply control office is centrally located and has the responsibility of determining storage locations; stock levels; initiates action leading to procurement; directs the issue of general engineer equipment and supplies; allocates regulated items; prepares and issues shipping instructions on items received from procurement; and conducts availability studies. A civilian personnel costs of this program are less than 3 percent of the anticipated procurement work load.

The program for equipment and supplies for the Army for which \$386,897,000 is budgeted under this project is to provide for the procurement of engineer items of equipment and supplies for support of troops of the regular Army; provision for additional equipment and supplies required to equip units to be activated during fiscal year 1952; 50 percent equipment for the civilian components peacetime usage; the authorized increase in pipe line and stock levels; and for the local procurement of engineer supplies within the Far East command. Many hundreds of items are procured under this program. They consist of vehicles, construction equipment, electronics and communications equipment, maintenance and operating equipment, acids, chemicals, gasses, cylinders, bridges, digging equipment, wire, rope, construction and related materials, hand and machine tools and related supplies, and many others.

Project 320, Army Repairs and Utilities, for which \$441,380,000 is requested, is to enable the Corps of Engineers to carry out its responsibilities of providing for utility services; maintenance of structures, grounds, roads and utility systems, fire protection; insect and rodent control; and packing and crating, etc., throughout the world.

Project 330, real estate activities, for which \$35,443,000 is requested, is to provide for payment of rents on leased property and for management and disposal of real estate in this country and overseas. An increase of \$10,443,000 over the amount required for 1951 is due to the increased size of the Army and to the larger numbers employed over-

seas. It is the responsibility of the Corps of Engineers to acquire, manage and dispose of all real estate for the Department of the Army.

Project 410, Repairs and Maintenance of Engineer Military Equipment, for which \$179,223,000 is requested is to provide funds to cover the cost of repair and maintenance to engineer military equipment (except equipment required for repairs and utilities) within the Zone of the Interior and in overseas commands and to cover depot type maintenance of engineer equipment assigned to the Department of the Air Force. 1951 fiscal year funds were utilized in the repair of engineer equipment valued at \$84,000,000; to modify and modernize equipment valued at \$10,000,000; to inspect, operationally test, and repair where necessary, approximately \$150,000,000 worth of equipment in stock; to meet spare parts issue demand; to improve the stock position of spare parts; and to procure concurrent spare parts for new end items. The funds herein requested are to cover the cost of all echelons of maintenance and repair to engineer military equipment in use within the United States (except equipment required for repairs and utilities). It includes the cost of field maintenance of troop equipment, field maintenance of operating equipment such as tractors, cranes, compressors, etc., and the complete cost of the program for overhaul and rebuild of equipment to be conducted through the eleven engineer depot maintenance shops, including depot type maintenance of equipment assigned to the Air Force. It provides the same type of services for overseas commands for which \$39,828,720 of the above request.

Project 420, Storage and Issue of Engineer Military Supplies and Equipment, for which \$36,000,000 is requested, indicating a \$12,000,000 increase over the amount provided for this purpose in fiscal year 1951, is to cover the receipt, storage, care and preservation, and the issuance of engineer military supplies and equipment at camps, posts, and stations: at engineer sections of general depots, and at engineer depots. In overseas theaters, engineer storage operations are performed at both general depots and engineer depots. Of the increase requested, \$3,850,827 is required for storage operation within the Zone of the Interior and \$8,149,173 for storage operations in overseas commands. In the Zone of the Interior the fund requirement is to provide for increased tonnage work load resulting from increase received from the procurement program; increase shipments to the expanded Army; increase returns from troop units as the result of equipment modernization program; increase in-storage care and preservation activities to cover items returned by troop units; and the operation of lumber stock piling yards for a full year. In addition to the activities performed for the Army funds are provided for the Department of the Air Force on a common-servicing basis.

Project 430, Engineer Operations, for which \$7,000,000 is requested, is to provide funds for engineering planning, development of design criteria, and minor miscellaneous engineer operations with which the Chief of Engineers has been charged. An increase of 210 man years services is requested, from 688 in fiscal year 1951 to 898 in fiscal year 1952.

Project 440, Military Surveys of Maps, for which \$45,000,000 is requested—an increase of \$16,000,000 over the funds provided for this purpose for fiscal year 1951—is to provide funds for mapping and

engineer intelligence activities of the United States and in the overseas commands. Operations conducted under this program are based on directives to the Chief of Engineers and the theater commanders which established the areas of strategic importance and the amount of mapping to be accomplished. The Chief of Engineers has been directed to accelerate the 1946 mapping program and complete the first priority requirements of that program at the earliest practicable date. The committee was assured that this mapping program has been carefully coordinated with the programs of other Federal mapping agencies and with commercial agencies doing work in this field. \$4,500,000 of the funds herein requested is for transfer to the U. S. Geological Survey for continuation of the work during fiscal year 1952. Due to the accelerated directive and program personal services have been increased from 2,300 in fiscal year 1951 to 4,049 man years in 1952.

Project 510, Operation of Engineer Schools, for which \$2,527,000 is requested—showing an increase of \$902,300 over the fiscal year of 1951 funds—is to provide funds for operation of the engineer school and related activities at Fort Belvoir, Virginia, for which a major portion of funds are required; and for overseas engineer schools. An increase of personal services from 287 man years in 1951 to 464 man years in 1952 is indicated. The increases both in money and in personnel is due principally to an increase from an output of 14,500 officers and enlisted students at the engineer school, Fort Belvoir, in the fiscal year 1951 to 30,000 in fiscal year 1952. The committee was advised that consideration was being given to a program to further increase the number of students trained at Fort Belvoir to meet an increasing demand for engineers by the Air Force.

Project 520, Engineer Field Training, for which \$1,200,000 is requested, reflects an increase of \$294,070 over the funds provided for fiscal year 1951. The purpose of this project is to provide funds for engineer field training, the amount requested being for the employment of equipment instructors in the amount of \$531,588; for travel of these instructors to permit adequate coverage of all engineer troops \$45,358; and for other normal requirements including local purchase of training material, such as bridge timber and cement not otherwise obtainable, \$623,054. An increase in personal services of 23 man years, from 87 to 110, is requested. The increased request both for funds and man years of employment is due to the fact that the requirements for 1952 are based on an expanded Army for a full year while the 1951 requirements were based on a reduced troop strength over a considerable portion of the year.

The committee recommends a reduction in this request for appropriation in the amount of \$35,000,000, of which \$20,000,000 shall be applied against the estimated civilian personnel requirement. The budget estimates contained funds for an average number of 88,683 civilian employees, and there was on the payroll as of June 30, 1951, 72,197. An increased number of personnel will be required during the year, but in the opinion of the committee the estimated requirement may be reduced by some 6,000 man years of employment without injury to the program. An additional reduction in the sum of \$15,000,000 is recommended to be applied to the various items under the appropriation, it being the opinion of the committee that such

reduction can be made through better management, and rescheduling projects without injury to the program.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY

The Congress appropriated in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1950, \$32,000,000 cash and provided \$48,363,700 contract authority for construction in Alaska and Okinawa. Engineer plans and designs are complete so that contracts can be consummated for all the work not presently under contract. Obligation of the amount for construction will be completed by June 30, 1951, and liquidation of the contract authority will be required during the fiscal year. The request herein for \$48,363,700 is to liquidate the contract authority.

ORDNANCE SERVICE AND SUPPLIES, ARMY

The appropriation "Ordnance Service and Supplies, Army" for which \$8,616,011,000 is requested, is for the purpose of providing all ordnance services, procurement, and supplies for the needs of the Army. The major programs under this appropriation are for procurement \$7,113,100,000; maintenance and operation \$1,216,300,000 and industrial mobilization \$44,300,000 and research and development \$242,300,000. The major procurement program covers such items as ammunition, artillery, small arms, tanks, and combat vehicles, other motor vehicles, and aircraft and targets. Nothing is more important than to provide the troops in combat with these items of ordnance procurement necessary to enable them to accomplish their objectives. Information presented to the committee indicated most careful consideration had been given to the procurement program, the coordination of the various activities to provide the best equipment to the troops in combat and in training, and to provide the greatest possible protection to the civilian population, to cities and to provinces.

Project 110, Maintenance of Mobilization Facilities and Industrial Mobilization Planning, for which \$44,332,000 is requested, is to provide funds for the programs pertaining to industrial mobilization at arsenals, plants and works, depot and district offices and for those activities which will facilitate the assumption of war time production by industry in the event of an emergency. The work will be accomplished by civilian industrial or engineering facilities, scientific and educational institutions, by government establishments, or by cooperative efforts of any combination thereof. \$13,936,000 of the funds requested herein will be required to continue normal maintenance, guard protection and rehabilitation of plant equipment at stand-by plants and stand-by portions of arsenals, and to continue annual inspection of plants; \$3,000,000 will be required to continue surveillance and maintenance of machine tools and production equipment in the industrial equipment reserve; \$25,535,000 will be used to continue the policy of contracting with industry for the purpose of obtaining their recommendation for the acceleration of production and for preparation and revision of drawings and specifications, production engineering on standard items, development of final inspection methods and establishment of pilot lines; \$1,861,000 will be used to accelerate mobilization planning as it affects the determination of

requirements and planning at ordnance installations and the 14 ordnance district offices; and \$18,557,140 is required for 5,290 man years of employment.

Project 111, Cataloging (Munitions Board) and Standardization, for which \$566,000 is requested, is to provide for the continuation of the conversion of Ordnance Corps and Federal standard stock nomenclature and identification numbers to the Munitions Board system.

Project 120, Procurement of Ammunition, for which \$1,325,266,000 is requested, is to provide for an adequate production base and for an adequate reserve of ammunition in support of the expanded Army. Nothing is more important in combat than ammunition, and our troops must have the best ammunition that can be produced and in adequate quantities.

Project 131, Procurement of Artillery, for which \$255,335,000 is requested, is to provide artillery, and the different types of antiaircraft artillery required in the defense of our principal cities and ports, troop concentrations, manufacturing centers, and the seats of government. The new antiaircraft weapons provide fire control for protection against high and fast flying aircraft electrically directed and controlled that do not depend upon visual acuity for effectiveness.

Project 132, Procurement of Small Arms, for which \$18,156,000 is requested, is to provide for the procurement of grenade launchers, rocket launchers, mounts and user test items needed to meet current training requirements including the cost of arsenal manufacture, special tooling for new weapons, acceptance testing, travel, transportation and overhead expenses incident to manufacture and procurement of ordnance material.

Project 133, Procurement of Tanks and Combat Vehicles, for which \$4,201,465,000 is requested, is to provide for the continuation of tank production initiated under prior appropriations plus some new armored and tank recovery vehicles. The unit costs are based upon the latest estimates from industry in coordination with ordnance engineers. These costs include proof testing, travel and transportation as well as engineering on-vehicle-material, and final processing through intermediate depots.

The contracts contain price redetermination clauses and are subject to the renegotiation provisions of law.

Project 134, Procurement of Other Motor Vehicles, for which \$1,268,681,000 is requested, is to cover procurement of the newest and most modern type tactical vehicles required for the armed forces. The unit costs are based upon the latest contract prices where available or upon the latest estimate of industry. The prices include engineering, testing, procurement, travel and transportation.

Project 135, Procurement of Army Aircraft, for which \$44,239,000 is requested, is for the procurement of aircraft for use by the Army in emergency evacuation and liaison missions and to transport material on missions where the objective cannot be reached by any other means.

Project 410, Preservation of Ordnance Material, for which \$931,990,000 is requested, is to provide funds required for maintenance in storage of depot stocks and pre-delivery inspection and processing of material to be issued; funds required to cover the overhaul and rebill of ordnance unserviceable stocks to meet requirements; funds to cover the procurement of spare parts, accessories and materials used

for maintenance of material in storage and in use with troops throughout the world; for field maintenance of administrative vehicles; for services of technical consultants on maintenance of new fire control systems; for maintenance of ordnance material in the hands of troops in the United States and in overseas commands. To perform the labor required for this project 21,223 man years of personal services is budgeted for at a cost of \$71,033,000 reflecting an increase in man years of 6,382 and in cost of \$23,907,300.

Project 420, Preservation of Ammunition, for which \$84,453,000 is requested, is to provide funds for the surveillance of ammunition including the observation, inspection, investigation, test, study and classification of ammunition, ammunition components, and explosives in movement, storage and use with respect to degree of serviceability and rate of deterioration; for normal maintenance of ammunition which represents such repair work as required on a recurring basis, and changes in pack, linking, etc., to meet training issue demands for ammunition and issues for combat reserves in overseas commands in support of the field forces; and for the renovation of ammunition which includes major repair of ammunition to restore an item to serviceable condition by disassembling its assemblies and sub-assemblies, inspecting and replacing parts, and reassembly and final inspection.

Project 430, Current Expenses of the Ordnance Corps, for which \$181,957,000 is requested, is to provide for the receipt, storage and issue operation at 33 storage depots, 13 plants and works and for other than personal services at 5 ordnance supply sections Quartermaster General depots engaged in the receipt, storage and issue of ordnance material, including the consolidation of stock to obtain maximum and economic utilization of storage space and stock control, both national and field installations of all ordnance material in field service stocks. It is estimated that 5,225,343 tons of ordnance material will be handled incident to receipt issue and inspection and processing of stores at the several installations. A subproject of this activity covers the compilation of technical data and the writing, illustration and editing of technical and supply catalog manuscripts on ordnance material; for the operation of the 14 ordnance districts engaged in activities in connection with the procurement of standard ordnance material and ordnance research and development projects, and for inspection service for arsenals, other districts and other departments of the national military establishment. The project covers also the activities of setting in type, printing, binding, preparation for shipment and shipment on a non-reimbursable basis of 550,000,000 press pages or the equivalent thereof of approved printing comprising intra-service printing of the Ordnance Corps and of any other service of the Department of the Army, provided capacity is available; and the support of Chief of Ordnance programs such as safety, national intelligence, survey, ordnance field safety office, civilian personnel suboffice at Rock Island Arsenal, and miscellaneous supplies furnished field installations.

Project 435, Maintenance of Army Aircraft, for which \$7,422,000 is requested, is for the procurement of replenishment spare parts, accessories and materials required for the maintenance of Army aircraft in the hands of the expanded Army, of which \$3,550,000 is required for spare parts for continued maintenance of approximately 1,600 new

aircraft to be delivered during fiscal year 1951. By joint Army-Air Force agreements, the Army is responsible for the maintenance of Army aircraft through field maintenance; and the Air Force is responsible for depot maintenance of Army aircraft on a common service basis.

Project 510, Ordnance Technical Training, for which \$9,886,000 is requested, is divided into 4 programs as follows: Ordnance Schools and Board for which \$4,574,309 is requested; Operational Training Activities for which \$522,164 is requested; Apprentice Training for which \$2,249,575 is requested; and Army Training Aids for which \$2,539,952 is requested. The activity Ordnance Schools and Boards provides for the operation of the permanent technical service schools, special courses at various locations for the training of instructors and key personnel on new weapons and equipment, tuition of selective civilian employees attending colleges and non-military technical schools, and for the continued operation of the Ordnance Board. The training provided is essential to provide qualified specialists in military units and at field and depot maintenance shops in the continental United States and throughout the world wherever United States troops are stationed.

The Operational Training Activities is a direct adjunct to the regular research and development, manufacturing, procurement and maintenance activities as distinguished from formal, full time school and classroom programs and apprentice training in shop crafts. It is divided into three categories (a) engineering and scientific training which is to provide arsenals and laboratories with a source of junior engineers and scientists; (b) student aid program which is a program to employ students attending recognized schools of technology on a planned and supervised training basis during school vacations in summer months; (c) group training of regular employees which consist of regional or group assemblies for training or indoctrination of regular ordnance employees in new methods and procedures or in techniques for which improvements may be attained through such seminars.

Apprentice Training provides for training at 15 ordnance establishments in the skilled trades in order to insure an adequate supply of the specialists required by the corps both for its immediate and long range needs. The committee was advised that there is a critical shortage in the national labor market of skilled tradesmen such as mechanics, tool-makers, artillery field mechanics, electricians, and lack skills for ordnance equipment that fully justifies the operation of this program. The activity for Army training aids brings the ordnance program into full participation in the Department of the Army plans for uniform and coordinated provision of training aids for using troops and activities.

A careful analysis of the Ordnance program indicates to the committee that due to some lag in deliveries, funds requested in these estimates will not all be required to meet payments during fiscal year 1952, and that through some rescheduling the program can be carried along at an efficient rate with a slightly less expenditure during the fiscal year. Because of such analysis the committee recommends an over-all reduction of \$308,511,000, of which \$30,000,000 shall be applied against the employment of approximately 13,000 man-years of civilian employment, the balance of \$278,511,000 to be applied

against rescheduled production programs, leaving for appropriation \$8,307,500,000. The estimates from which these reductions are made were prepared several months ago and the committee feels that present evaluations will permit the reductions recommended without harm to the over-all program.

CHEMICAL SERVICE, ARMY

The appropriation for "Chemical Service, Army," for which \$122,560,000 is requested is to provide for the procurement, manufacture and supply; education and training; and research and development for chemical warfare, biological warfare, and radiological warfare. The request is divided in two projects the first of which is—

Project 110, Industrial Mobilization and Procurement Planning, for which \$8,263,000 is requested, is to provide for a balanced program of industrial mobilization and procurement planning which includes provision for maintenance of standby portions of Chemical Corps arsenals in a realistic state of readiness that will be required in the first year of full mobilization and for contract maintenance of one government owned plant in industry; for acquisition, rehabilitation, modernization, transportation, preservation, and storage of war reserve machine tools, manufacturing aids, and other items of production equipment having long lead time for acquisition; for purchase from industry or educational, scientific, or private agencies of plans, data designs or prototypes of machinery or other items necessary for rapid acceleration of production; for cost of the Munitions Board industrial security program; and for the preparation of Chemical Corps supply catalogs, specifications and the development of standards for supply and procurement of chemical items.

Project 120, Procurement and Manufacture, for which \$63,037,000 is requested, is to provide the funds required to meet the procurement objectives of the Chemical Corps. The Committee was advised that the fiscal year 1952 procurement program of the Chemical Corps will be greatly enlarged to provide cross-servicing in procuring chemical supplies and equipment for the Navy, Marine Corps, Air Force, and other departments of the Army technical services. The Chemical Corps proposes to operate seven procurement offices to procure or manufacture quantities of Chemical Corps items but the financing of the program to meet mobilization reserve requirements will be deferred until fiscal year 1953.

Project 310, Maintenance and Operation of Facilities, for which \$10,494,000 is requested, is to provide funds required for the operation, maintenance and installation support to be provided by the Chemical Corps or by Zone of Interior Army commanders at the active industrial facilities of the Chemical Corps such as the Army Chemical Center, Camp Dietrich, Pinebluff Arsenal, Rocky Mountain Arsenal, and Dugway Proving Ground. The request includes funds for the operation, maintenance and repair of the utilities plants and systems at these installations and for security protection at Camp Dietrich and Dugway Proving Grounds which is the responsibility of the Chemical Corps.

Project 410, Maintenance and Supply of Matériel, for which \$15,096,000 is requested, is to provide funds for the salaries of 1,966 civilian employees, 1,601 of whom will be employed in three Chemical

Corps branch depots and one storage area, 231 in the Army areas, 111 in the overseas commands, and 23 in the Chemical Corps Board. This reflects an increase of 39 civilian employees over the requirements for fiscal year 1951. The employees in the Chemical Corps branch depots in the storage area, as well as those in the Army and overseas areas, are required for the care and preservation, in-storage maintenance, receipt, storage, issue, and shipment of Chemical Corps matériel for the support of the augmented armed forces.

Project 510, Education and Training, for which \$906,000 is requested, is to provide funds for the operation and maintenance of Chemical Corps training facilities including funds for the Army Chemical training center to be located at Fort McClellan, Alabama. Funds are requested also for the unit training and historical activity located at the Army Chemical Center, Maryland, and a small amount for three of the six Army areas. \$106,000 of the funds is requested to permit the Chemical Corps to meet increased loads placed on training facilities as the result of the expansion of the active Army.

ARMY TRAINING

The request for appropriation for army training in the amount of \$22,500,000 is to finance the office, Chief of Army Field Forces, which supervises the training of all individuals and units utilized by the Army in the field; 15 Army service schools; 2 joint colleges; 4 Army field forces boards and their arctic test branch, which perform the user tests of equipment to be used by the Army in the field; the training aids center recently established in each Army area; the implementation of the Army-Navy agreement whereby the Army will participate in the Navy's special devices center in the development of new training devices; and the tuition of military personnel being trained in civilian institutions. 54% of the request is for civilian employees and a substantial portion of the increased funds received in fiscal year 1951, and the further increases requested in fiscal year 1952 are directly attributable to continuing efforts to divert a larger portion of the military strength into combat units and utilize civilians in administrative and housekeeping jobs. It is interesting to note that in fiscal year 1950 there were a total of 1,697 civilians for the activities financed by this appropriation. During the build-up of the Army in fiscal year 1951 some 1,862 additional civilians were added making a total of 3,559 civilians. Almost half of the increase, however, or 890, are civilians replacing military personnel so that the net increase was actually 972. The request contained herein contemplates a further increase of 716 civilians to a total of 4,275 but approximately 60 percent of this number, or 419, are to replace military, so that the net increase requested is only 297.

The committee recommends an appropriation for the above activities in the amount of \$22,300,000, a reduction of \$200,000 below the estimates, the reduction to be applied against the employment of approximately 50 man-years of civilian personnel:

UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY, MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION

The request for appropriation for United States Military Academy in the amount of \$6,305,000 is to provide for the maintenance of

buildings, grounds, roads, and training facilities; for the support of the academic and administrative activities, including administration of the post at West Point and the corps of cadets and expenses for the operation of twelve academic departments; for the academy's proportionate share of maintenance costs of facilities used by the West Point preparatory school at Stewart Air Force Base; and for the observance of the sesquicentennial of the military academy. \$487,600 of the request is for special projects above and beyond the realm of routine maintenance. Included in these funds for special projects are the rewirings of ancient electrical systems within buildings; necessary replacement or rehabilitation of refrigeration, heating, and sanitary facilities; lighting revisions in academic buildings in order to achieve proper lighting standards; conversion of idle structures into useful buildings; provision of adequate storage facilities; and construction of additional training facilities.

ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

The request for appropriation for the Army National Guard in the amount of \$203,002,000 is for the procurement of supplies and equipment; maintenance of structures and operation of utilities; operating expenses, including maintenance of chattels; education and training; and departmental salaries and overhead. National Guardsmen not in active service are being progressively trained by means of the modern three-year National Guard training program, in 48 armory drills, 15 days summer field training, 6 2-day weekends of additional training, and a school program for selected personnel. Attendance at armory drills by both officers and enlisted men has increased to a very satisfactory level. The committee was informed that during fiscal year 1951 6,496 National Guardsmen have been enrolled in courses at the Army service schools; 3,582 in Army area schools; 15,605 in State-conducted unit schools; and 34,089 National Guardsmen have been participating in the Army extension course program. This progressive training with suitable training aids available, and supervised by competent instructors, is largely responsible for the success of the National Guard program.

During fiscal year 1952 it is anticipated that training will consist of the usual 48 armory drills and 15 days' summer field training, 3 2-day weekends of additional training, and a school program.

Weekly drills are essential to provide progressive continuity of training and the annual two weeks of field training provide an opportunity for the assembly of major units, and for individual and unit training under field conditions. Weekend training supplements the armory drills by providing outdoor field training where instruction and practical experience can be gained in such subjects as actual preparation of food by mess personnel, familiarization and qualification firing of individual and crew-served weapons, individual and unit tactical training, marches and bivouacs, service practice for artillery, tracking missions for anti-aircraft artillery and signal communications. Provision is made for the procurement of ammunition required for training purposes, for clothing and individual equipment for the anticipated increased strength and replacement of worn-out items, for special items of arctic clothing and individual equipment for the Alaska National Guard, and for the procurement of

secondary items of organizational equipment. Provision is also made for the expenses of opening, operating, and closing Federal and State camp sites for summer field training, and for other normal expenses of the National Guard activities.

Six National Guard divisions have been called into service, and the committee has been informed that an additional two divisions may be called into Federal service within the near future. The present program anticipates a military strength in the National Guard of 320,000 by June 30, 1952.

Near the close of fiscal year 1951 the department reviewed its requirements for civilian personnel in the light of actual procurement of such personnel and in this appropriation determined that because of inability to employ the number anticipated earlier that the man-year requirement for fiscal year 1952 would be 5 less than requested in the estimates. The committee accordingly has recommended a reduction of \$20,000 in the request leaving for appropriation the sum of \$202,982,000.

ORGANIZED RESERVE CORPS, ARMY

The request for appropriation of \$106,536,000 for the Organized Reserve Corps is to provide for a total active reserve strength of 75,000 officers and 130,000 enlisted personnel to receive reserve duty pay and 15 days annual active duty unit field training. In addition 15,000 officers of the volunteer reserve will receive 15 days active duty field training or its equivalent and further, the funds provide for a progressive school program of individual training for 33,126 members of the active reserve.

The mission of the organized Reserve Corps is to provide, in the event of an emergency, units effectively organized, trained, and equipped for rapid mobilization, expansion, and development in the United States Army; and to furnish trained individuals for augmentation of the active Army. With funds provided during fiscal year 1951 mandatory field training has been provided for the first time.

The committee was advised at the close of fiscal year 1951 that anticipated civilian personnel requirement had not been met and that a reduction of 734 man-years of civilian employment could be made in the requirements for fiscal year 1952. Accordingly the requested amount was reduced by a total of \$1,726,000, leaving for appropriation \$105,810,000.

RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS, ARMY

The \$27,236,000 request for appropriation for the Reserve Officers' Training Corps is to provide for the procurement of junior officers for the Organized Reserve Corps, the Regular Army, and to some extent the National Guard. The present program indicates a requirement from this source of 1,200 to be commissioned in the Regular Army and 22,000 to be commissioned in the Reserves at the rank of lieutenants. Funds requested in the senior division are for the support of 516 units in 268 institutions, 36 of which will begin operating in September 1951. In this division students normally pursue the basic course in their freshman and sophomore years, then the advanced course for two academic years of instructions plus a six weeks summer training camp.

A major portion of the students who successfully complete the advanced course are tendered commissions in the Organized Reserve Corps while a select group of distinguished graduates are tendered appointment in the Regular Army.

The mission of the junior division is to lay the foundation of intelligent citizenship within the student and give as much basic military training as will be of benefit and value to him and the military service if he becomes a member thereof.

The committee was advised that anticipated civilian manyear strength were not realized at the end of fiscal year 1951 and that accordingly the appropriation could stand a reduction in the estimates of 118 manyears of employment during fiscal year 1952, or a dollar reduction of \$95,000, which leaves for appropriation \$27,141,000.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY CIVILIAN COMPONENTS

The appropriation request for \$24,000,000 for military construction, Army civilian components, is to augment the provisions of Public Law 783, 81st Congress, approved September 11, 1950, which provides for the construction of facilities and armories for the Army National Guard and the organized Reserves. It is estimated that the armory requirement to house the planned strength of the Army National Guard is 2,800 armories. A total of 1,087 of those now available are considered to be adequate and 325 other armories are susceptible of being made adequate by expansion, leaving a new construction requirement of 1,388 armories. It is presently estimated that the cost of the long range expansion and new construction program will be \$275,000,000. There is requested for fiscal year 1952 for armory construction \$16,000,000, which will provide for the construction of 113 armories suitable to house 204 units, and for the expansion of 34 existing armories all the work to be performed in accordance with established priority.

Non-armory construction, for which \$8,000,000 is requested is to provide for the construction of warehouses, motor vehicle storage buildings, Army aircraft hangars and maintenance shop at National Guard installations. Approximately \$39,475,000 of this program has been completed from prior year appropriations. There remains a requirement of approximately \$80,000,000 for ultimate completion of the program. The present request will provide for the construction of 141 motor vehicle storage buildings, 17 warehouses, 13 liaison aircraft hangars, 14 maintenance shops, and 50 target ranges.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT, ARMY

Statements are frequently heard to the effect that the ultimate success of our Army in time of war will be determined largely by its ability to achieve the qualitative superiority in weapons which will be necessary to overcome the numerical superiority of a potential enemy. Present commitments of the United Nations forces bear out on a small scale the truth of such statements. Efforts toward the accomplishment of superiority in weapons is the purpose of the request for research and development funds, and reports indicate that significant and encouraging accomplishments have been made in this direction during fiscal year 1951. The program presented in the present request was developed to meet specific objectives established by the

Army under policies of the National Security Council, strategic guidance of the joint Chiefs of Staff, scientific and technical guidance of the Research and Development Board and of many scientific consultants and advisors, requirements from the using arms and services set forth in the Army equipment development guide, and new requirements stemming from the dictates of operational action in Korea. The request contained herein for direct research and development costs total \$364,999,600, divided between the seven technical services of the Army.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT, TRANSPORTATION SERVICE, ARMY

\$6,260,600 of the above request for Research and Development funds is to cover the Transportation Corps portion of the over-all research and development activity of the Department of the Army. The Transportation Corps' program is integrated with all other research and development programs of the Army. It participates in the over-all activity by performing scientific analyses and research to the development of the most advanced transportation equipment; for the designing and service testing of pilot models in order to provide new and better equipment for use by the Department of Defense; investigation and study of transportation support-airhead operations, highway transportation, and material handling equipment in order to properly prepare military characteristics on desired items for submission to the technical service having development responsibilities.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT, MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL DEPARTMENT, ARMY

Of the over-all amount requested for research and development, \$10,079,000 is budgeted for Medical and Hospital Department, Army, which is to cover the medical research and development program largely concentrated on basic research of medical aspects of operations under conditions of extreme cold; the treatment of radiation injury, psychiatric and psychological problems encountered with troops; the development of physical and mental health standards for the most efficient selection and use of manpower; the wartime handling of casualties and their rehabilitation; the prevention and treatment of infectious and parasitic diseases of major military importance in magnitudes and under conditions of transmittal and treatment not ordinarily encountered in civilian life; research on medical supplies and equipment adapted both to scientific advances and the changing concepts of military operation; and information to afford the direct research and development needs and research and development advisory services included in the responsibilities of the Army Medical Service. The problems requiring Army Medical Service research are all aimed at the maintenance of health and the conservation of personnel under the conditions imposed during war. As in the other technical service, the committee is advised that the work plan for the Medical and Hospital research program has been coordinated with such other research to eliminate duplication.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT, QUARTERMASTER SERVICE

The request for \$15,304,000 for research and development in the Quartermaster Service field is to provide for the development of equipment essential for aerial delivery of supplies from aircraft in flight; vehicle and weapon platforms ranging from 3,500 to 16,000 pounds capacity; 6,000 pound load bearing platforms; heavy duty parachutes; quick release devices to facilitate immediate release of the parachute upon impact with the earth; and other developments in the Quartermaster field. Environmental protection research, for which the Quartermaster Corps has Army-wide responsibility, is designed to provide data essential to end item development and to complete clothing almanacs which will provide for the first time a scientific basis for the issue of clothing and equipment. Among the most difficult of problems facing the Quartermaster Service are the problems concerning food, clothing and personal equipment relating to weather extremes. From past research Arctic needs are now fairly well understood, but requirement for extremely hot weather conditions have not been completely developed, nor has research been completed for extremely dry or extremely wet cold areas. Emphasis of the food research and development program is on combat type rations, their acceptability, stability and nutritional adequacy. It has been found that protecting the soldier from insects is almost as difficult as protecting him from enemy missiles. Through development of insect repellents and treated clothing it is hoped to provide the necessary protection. Other objectives of the research and development program are to reduce the size, weight, and cubage of equipment and to improve the operating efficiency of the utilities which accompany the soldier in his field activity.

The research and development program of the technical services of the Army have been coordinated through the research program of the Department of the Army, the Research and Development Board, and other cooperating agencies in an effort to provide the most effective and most economically produce requirement for an efficient and effective Army. In general it is the first purpose to perfect the end item and then set about reducing its cost. The aim of research and development is national defense at its lowest cost.

DEPARTMENTAL SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The request for Departmental Salaries and Expenses for which \$70,000,000 is requested, covers the salaries and expenses of civilian employees at the departmental level in the Washington, D. C. area. The request reflects an increase over the requirement for fiscal year 1951 of something over \$12,000,000. The workload of these offices is somewhat increased because of current conditions including the build up of the Army, the augmented procurement program, etc. A reevaluation of requirements by the department at the end of the last fiscal year indicated that a reduction of 669 employees at a dollar value of \$1,789,429 might be made. Upon further consideration the committee feels that by proper management in the use of these civilian employees an over-all reduction of 1,000 man-years of employment at a dollar reduction of \$3,785,500, distributed as indicated in the table

appearing at the back of this report can well be made and recommends accordingly.

LANGUAGE CHANGES, ARMY

Only minor changes in language have been made in this bill from the wording appearing in the 1951 bill. Almost all of the changes are for purposes of clarity and simplification of the wording. The enactment of Public Law 830, approved September 23, 1950, made it possible to delete specific references to personal services at the seat of government, printing and binding, health programs and tort claims. The more important language changes are as follows:

Under the heading, Travel of the Army, a number of specific references to various types of travel and travel allowances carried in the 1951 Act have been deleted because they are all authorized by permanent law, section 303 of the Career Compensation Act.

Under the Quartermaster Corps appropriation for "Clothing and equipage" a limitation is included reading as follows:

Provided, That none of the funds appropriated in this or any other Act, and none of the property procured therewith, shall be available for transfer to any working capital fund under the provisions of section 405 (d) of the National Security Act, as amended.

The purpose of the provision is to prevent the capitalization of any stocks on hand, or any stocks procured in the future, from being used as working capital for industrial funds or stock funds. It would require that working capital funds or stock funds be based on specific appropriations for that purpose. Since the Quartermaster Corps has been required to set up a stock fund in the "Clothing and equipage" item as of July 1, 1951, the proposed language will permit the liquidation of such fund and a return to the former procedures.

Under the heading "Medical and Hospital Department," previous language covering employment of nurses, cooks and other civilians as prescribed by the Secretary, has been deleted since the same purpose can be accomplished by employing such emergency personnel as exempted employees under the Civil Service and Classification Acts.

Under the heading "United States Military Academy," new wording as follows has been inserted to provide for expenditures incident to the program for observing the Military Academy Sesquicentennial, including necessary contingencies:

expenses, including not to exceed \$95,000 for contingencies, incident to the observance of the Sesquicentennial of the Military Academy;

Under the National Guard and Organized Reserves appropriations, the following wording has been inserted to provide for expenditures for subsistence of personnel on training duty of 8 or more hours in any one day. This is particularly important to ensure that personnel who spend an entire day in range firing during weekends not be required to provide food at their own expense. It is clear that interest in this highly important type of training will soon lag if no funds are available to feed the men during the day:

Subsistence for drills of 8 or more hours duration in any one calendar day.

Also under the National Guard and Organized Reserves appropriations, new wording has been inserted to provide for the issue of supplies and equipment from Army stocks without reimbursement. This is considered particularly important to cover the issue of specialized,

expensive weapons and equipment to units in training, so that they may become thoroughly familiar with the weapons and proficient in their use and operation. This provides a feasible method of ensuring early readiness for defense emergencies of selected units. At the same time, provision has been made for recalling such property so that it may be immediately available for combat requirements or for redistribution to other units found to be in a more advanced state of training and readiness.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

GENERAL STATEMENT

The responsibilities of the Navy and the Marine Corps have not changed. In short those responsibilities might be stated to be "the control of the seas". The mission of the Navy as stated to the committee by the Secretary of the Navy is—

* * * to assure the safe and expeditious movement of men and materials to their destination in peace and war; to support United States international commitments in peacetime; and to protect our shores in wartime.

Such a mission, to be supported by funds to be provided in the accompanying bill, anticipates that the Navy will maintain a maximum offensive power, be able to operate with maximum speed, efficiency and flexibility, and prosecute campaigns designed to insure command of the seas. The accomplishment of these components of our military forces during the past year gives confidence that the high traditions of the Navy will be maintained.

Details relating to programs will be found under appropriate headings in this report, and a breakdown of financial requests and recommendations will be found in the table beginning (for the Department of the Navy) on page 153 of this report.

CIVILIAN PERSONNEL

The budgetary requests for civilian personnel were predicated upon the military force requirements of the Navy agreed to by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Basic Naval Establishment Plan, prepared by the Chief of Naval Operations, which supports those forces. Such civilian personnel requirements are dependent upon the number of ships to be overhauled or repaired, aircraft to be overhauled, supporting stations to be operated, records to be processed, tonnage of material to be stored and issued, loading of ammunition and rockets, research and development projects, etc. Most of the procurement and production comes from commercial industrial sources, but for such work as ammunition loading, combat ship conversions and overhauls, the Navy must depend upon its own industrial facilities to handle this workload. These are the principal areas of production in which the Navy will require additional civilian employment. As civilian personnel is a means to manufacture, overhaul, and repair combat equipment and material in government plants, any change in the number of civilians employed by the Navy would not reduce the fund requirements. The funds are required in order to contract for the same urgent military items from commercial sources.

The Navy presented requests contemplating a total of 505,755 man-years of civilian employment in 1952, costing approximately \$1,910,000,000, but only 380,507 man-years costing \$1,427,000,000, are to be paid from the new annual appropriations contained in this bill. The remaining 125,248 man-years, at a cost of \$482,820,000, will be paid from prior year annual appropriations, reimbursements, revolving funds, and continuing appropriations for the completion of work which has already been authorized.

The civilian personnel requirement was estimated upon the projected operating needs and the production programs that could be accomplished within the naval establishment during the year. The estimates anticipated an employment of 464,000 civilians as of July 1, 1951, the beginning of the fiscal year. Present information is to the effect that only 446,000 were actually employed as of that date, resulting in a deficiency of 18,000. The committee was informed that the requirements and phasing of employment to support programs during the year remained the same, but due to entering the year with a lesser number of civilian employees than anticipated, there would be some savings. It is anticipated that a greater part of the savings will be in non-industrial employment. The committee has taken these facts into consideration in making civilian personnel reductions throughout the appropriation requests, and has effected reductions totaling 4,750 man-years of employment at a dollar savings of \$14,625,000 in the Department of the Navy.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY

This appropriation will provide funds necessary for pay, subsistence, permanent change of station travel, clothing (except special clothing), enlistment bonus, and separation costs of regular Navy officer and enlisted personnel, Naval Reserve personnel on extended active duty with the regular forces and Naval Reserve officer and enlisted personnel on continuous active duty in connection with the administration and training activities of the Reserve program. Funds provided herein cover basic pay, incentive pay for hazardous duty, subsistence allowances, quarters allowances, special pay, and other duly authorized pay and allowance items; subsistence in kind; travel and per diem allowances of Naval officer and enlisted personnel on permanent change of station including periods of temporary duty between permanent duty station, travel of certain personnel attending schools and other courses of instruction on returnable quotas, and transportation of dependents of naval personnel on permanent change of station in accordance with provisions of law; uniform gratuities for officers, and initial outfits of clothing and clothing maintenance allowances for enlisted personnel; enlistment bonus, and separation costs including unused leave payments, severance pay, mustering-out pay, six months' death gratuity, travel allowance on discharge or release from active duty, discharge gratuity, and interest on deposits.

An appropriation in the amount of \$2,463,365,000 is requested to support an average naval strength of 784,558 military personnel for the fiscal year 1952; the strength at the beginning of the year is estimated to be 735,000, increasing to 805,000 by June 30, 1952. It is planned to commence releasing enlisted Reserves who were ordered into the active naval service in fiscal year 1951 during the first month of fiscal

year 1952, and provision is made in the present request for the costs involved in separation of these personnel. The estimate for travel includes funds for payment to the Military Sea Transport Service for transportation furnished to Navy personnel and their dependents incident to permanent change of station. The above mentioned request for appropriations is divided as follows: "Pay and allowances," \$1,925,429,000; "subsistence in kind," \$253,282,000; "travel, permanent change of station," \$73,608,000; "individual clothing and uniform gratuity," \$110,901,000; and "other individual military personnel costs," \$100,145,000.

The officer personnel is approximately 10 percent of the overall military personnel strength of the Navy, and, of the above amount for "pay and allowances", it is estimated \$497,558,000 will be required for the pay of officer personnel while the pay of enlisted personnel will amount to \$1,427,871,000. The rates of pay of military personnel are fixed by law.

Under the activity "Subsistence in Kind," funds in the amount of \$253,282,000 are provided for (1) the cost of provisions issued to the general messes ashore, United States, \$1.045; (2) ashore outside the United States, \$1.164; and (3) afloat for regular and reserve enlisted personnel on active duty, \$1.189; the cost of subsisting in hospital messes regular and reserve enlisted personnel on active duty, inactive retired enlisted personnel and members of the Fleet Reserve, and hospital corpsmen and other enlisted personnel on duty in hospitals, \$1.11, with 16 cents additional for tubercular patients. In addition funds are provided for costs of flight, abandon ship, and emergency rations issued to personnel requiring the same; and the cost of food surveyed on account of spoilage or loss. The law requires that enlisted personnel on active duty shall be subsisted in kind or furnished a cash allowance in lieu thereof. To insure that enlisted personnel receive an adequate and balanced ration, it has been the policy of the Navy to furnish subsistence in kind to such personnel wherever practicable. The law likewise sets forth the food components of the Navy ration and the allowances to which each man is entitled.

Funds provided for the activity, "Travel, permanent change of station" in the amount of \$73,608,000 are to provide for travel costs incident to permanent change of station of military personnel paid under this appropriation, including transportation of dependents, as authorized by law. The travel covered by this program is essential to the effective utilization of active duty personnel. New recruits must be sent from places of enlistment to training centers for indoctrination and training and thence to first duty station before any useful work is realized. As enlisted personnel are lost by expiration of enlistment or other cause, redistribution of the remaining trained and experienced personnel must be made to maintain a balanced crew on each ship, station, or other activity. The call of officers to active duty, their rotation to duty assignments, and return to home upon separation are essential functions for maintaining an efficient and effective officer structure in the Navy. Transportation to be furnished to personnel and their dependents, or payment in lieu thereof, is prescribed by law or by regulations issued pursuant to law. The Congress has long recognized the necessity for travel funds and has provided many millions of dollars for such purposes. It is

realized, however, that excessive travel may be performed if careful supervision is not exercised over it. Because of the nature of the requirements under this program, the Department is admonished to provide a most careful supervision over the expenditure of these funds.

Of the \$110,901,000 requested for "Individual clothing and uniform gratuities", \$1,670,500 is for officer personnel and \$109,230,500 for enlisted personnel. Uniform gratuities are authorized by law or by regulations pursuant to law for active duty officer and enlisted personnel.

The cash clothing allowances provided under this program are likewise prescribed by law and regulations issued in accordance with the Career Compensation Act of 1949.

Under the activity, "Other individual military personnel costs",—for which \$100,145,000 is requested, are found the items "Separation costs, officers", \$6,450,000; "Separation costs, enlisted personnel", \$71,400,000; and "Reenlistment bonus"—\$22,295,000. Funds required for the "Separation costs, officers", are for payment of unused leave, separation and severance pay for physical disability, mustering-out pay, six months' death gratuity, and severance pay on failure of promotion. These payments are fixed by applicable provisions of law and must be paid as prescribed by such laws. The separation costs for enlisted personnel are for costs directly attributable to the discharge or release to inactive duty of enlisted personnel. These include payment for unused leave, separation and severance pay for physical disability, mustering-out pay, six months' death gratuity, travel allowance on discharge, discharge gratuity, and interest on deposits.

Funds for "Reenlistment bonus" provide for payment of a bonus to each of the enlisted personnel who reenlist under the conditions prescribed by Section 207 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949. The committee was advised that over 60 percent of the personnel whose enlistments expire are reenlisting, and that about 95 percent of the personnel eligible for the reenlistment bonus are reenlisting for six years. The estimate presented to the committee was based upon the assumption that 60 percent of the personnel whose enlistments expire will reenlist within three months, and that 95 percent of these will reenlist for six years.

Funds for incentive pay—hazardous duty—are provided herein for aviation duty; submarine duty; parachute jumping; duty involving care of lepers; demolition of explosives; duty at submarine escape training tanks; and duty at deep-sea-diving schools or Navy experimental diving unit. Such payments are made in accordance with statutory authority.

The committee has been disturbed about the use of travel funds throughout the services and feel that all necessary travel can be performed at a considerable savings to the appropriation account. Accordingly it is recommended that the travel fund requested in this estimate be reduced by \$3,608,000, leaving a balance in this item of \$70,000,000. In the light of investigation it is felt that a further reduction in the amount of \$3,282,000 can be made in the item for Supplies and Materials, leaving the amount recommended in that item \$253,000,000. This reflects an over-all reduction in the appropriation of \$6,890,000, leaving for the appropriation \$2,456,475,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVAL RESERVE

The appropriation for "Military Personnel, Naval Reserve" will provide funds necessary for the pay and allowances, subsistence, clothing, and travel of Naval Reserve organized and volunteer personnel engaged or participating in prescribed programs of Naval Reserve training. Included are funds for drill and command pay, with authorized allowanees, of members of the organized Reserves; authorized training-duty pay and subsistence of organized and volunteer reservists, with appropriate allowanees; and travel of organized and volunteer reservists in connection with their prescribed training duty assignments. Funds are also provided for necessary and authorized clothing issues or allowances for reservists participating in organized training or on training duty assignment, and for uniform gratuities for officers as authorized by law.

The Organized Reserve program for fiscal year 1952 will begin with approximately 152,800 officers and enlisted personnel, and it is anticipated that it will be built up to an end strength of 194,715 with an average strength for the year of 171,416. Included in this anticipated growth are personnel who were ordered to active military service during fiscal year 1951 and who are expected to rejoin the Organized Naval Reserve program in 1952.

Funds are included in the estimate for drill pay and authorized allowances for members of the Organized Reserve and for the military personnel costs of participation in an annual period of active duty for training, normally two weeks in duration.

The estimate for fiscal year 1952 provides for training 15,000 volunteer reservists with the fleet or at an appropriate shore activity.

Funds requested in the amount of \$62,718,000 are divided into the following activities: "Pay and allowances of inactive reservists"—\$46,604,000; "Subsistence of inactive reservists"—\$1,919,000; "Travel"—\$4,436,000; and "Individual clothing and uniform gratuities"—\$9,759,000. The \$46,604,000 for "Pay and allowances of inactive reservists" provides funds for the payment of drill pay to members of the Naval Reserve assigned to or associated with organized drilling units and to those members performing equivalent duties in a drill pay status. This program also provides for the payment of command pay for the satisfactory performance of administrative duties.

Rates of pay for members of the Naval Reserve participating in inactive duty training, including performance of administrative duties in connection with such training, are fixed by applicable provisions of law. The program provides for a total average on board strength of 171,416 officers and enlisted personnel in drill pay status performing inactive duty training.

A request of \$1,919,000 is contained in the estimate for "Subsistence of inactive reservists." Statutory law requires that enlisted personnel on active duty for training shall be subsisted in kind or furnished the cash allowance in lieu thereof. To insure that enlisted personnel receive an adequate and balanced ration it is the policy of the Navy to furnish subsistence in kind to such personnel wherever practicable. Subsistence, ashore and afloat, has been provided for in accordance with training program plans and at subsistence rates used for the regular Navy.

Funds for the activity, "Travel", in the amount of \$4,436,000 are requested as follows: "Training duty"—\$4,265,000; "Ferrying aircraft"—\$150,000; and "Disability benefits"—\$21,000. Such travel is an essential element in the conduct of the Naval Reserve training program which is performed on board vessels and at appropriate shore activities in the specialties of the individuals being trained. It requires round trip travel by personnel between their homes and the points at which training duty is performed. It likewise provides funds for travel of Naval Reservists disabled while engaged in inactive duty training or active duty training, upon discharge from hospitalization, in accordance with statutory provisions.

The request for funds for the activity "Individual clothing and uniform gratuities," in the amount of \$9,759,000 is divided between "Uniform gratuities" in the amount of \$1,293,100 and "Individual clothing" in the amount of \$8,465,900. It is anticipated that 4,156 newly commissioned officers will qualify for the authorized \$100 uniform gratuities through participation in the Naval Reserve program. The funds herein requested will provide for the payment of the initial and quadrennial uniform gratuity to officers of the inactive Naval Reserve who qualify under the provisions of the Naval Reserve Act of 1938. The 17,550 officers expected to qualify for \$50 quadrennial gratuities is based on a projection of those who will have established eligibility, either through periods of active duty, or through participating in inactive duty Naval Reserve programs over a four year period.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, OFFICER CANDIDATES

This appropriation will provide funds for pay and allowances, subsistence, and travel of midshipmen at the Naval Academy; pay, subsistence, and travel of aviation midshipmen engaged in flight training; retainer pay of commissioned officers Naval Aviation College program students; pay, subsistence, and clothing for members of the aviation cadet program; retainer pay, initial travel to school, travel to home on discharge, and required uniforms for regular Naval Reserve Officer Training Corps students attending college; required uniforms and authorized commuted rations for contract naval Reserve Officer Training Corps students attending college; active duty pay, travel expenses, including per diem, and subsistence in kind for Navy Reserve Officers Training Corps students (regular and contract) participating in prescribed summer training; pay, subsistence in kind, travel, and clothing of reserve officer candidate trainees participating in prescribed training programs.

In order to accomplish the task of education and training of officer candidates, the Naval Academy course is supplemented by the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps program, the Naval Aviation College program, the Naval Aviation Cadet program, and the Reserve Officer Candidate program. The average number of these programs for whom military personnel expenses are provided in this request are summarized as follows: midshipment, U. S. Naval Academy—3,716; N. R. O. T. C., regular students—6,715; N. R. O. T. C., contract students—7,602; commissioned officer N. A. C. P. students—500; aviation midshipmen—(this program is phasing out); naval aviation cadets—2,177; and reserve officer candidates—2,820 (total 23,532).

Since the scheduled summer training programs administered under this appropriation commence in June and extend into September, and since the exact starting dates of the various cruises are subject to wide variation due to revised operational schedules of ships and training stations, provision is again made to extend availability of the appropriation into fiscal year 1953.

Total funds in the amount of \$19,760,400 are requested to cover the requirements under this appropriation and are broken down as follows: (1) "Pay and allowances"—\$13,268,400; (2) "Subsistence"—\$1,615,800; (3) "Travel"—\$2,239,400; (4) "Individual clothing"—\$2,170,700; (5) "Other individual military personnel" costs—\$466,100. Subsequent to the preparation of this appropriation request the Congress enacted a Servicemen's Indemnity Act, effective July 1, 1951, Public Law 23, which provides that life insurance will be provided for certain officer candidates of the Navy free of charge. Heretofore, funds have been appropriated to cover this amount and it is estimated that of the \$466,100 herein requested there will now be no need for \$459,000 of this amount. Therefore, the request will be reduced by such amount, leaving an overall total of \$19,348,000 to be carried in this appropriation.

The request for \$13,268,400, for "Pay and allowances", is based on approved personnel plans which are designed to meet the needs of the service. The rate of pay and allowances are fixed by applicable provisions of law.

The \$1,615,800, requested for "Subsistence" under this program, is to furnish officer candidates rations as provided under applicable provisions of law. The daily rates upon which the computations are based are: General mess ashore—\$1.045; General mess afloat—\$1.189; Naval Academy—\$1.25; Marine platoon leaders—\$1.15.

The request for \$1,947,600 for "Travel of Officer Candidates" is to provide for initial travel, travel upon discharge, and travel under orders of midshipmen and officer candidates.

The request for \$2,170,700 for "Individual clothing" is to provide for an issue of clothing in kind to Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps students (regular and contract), Reserve Officer Candidates, and Naval Aviation Cadets. Uniforms are required to be worn by students while they are on active duty and on certain prescribed occasions such as drills and ceremonies. The estimate provides for increases in the price of clothing projected in accordance with anticipated procurement costs. Funds for necessary alteration and renovation of uniforms are also included in the estimate.

NAVY PERSONNEL, GENERAL EXPENSES

The general purposes of this request are: (1) To train officer and enlisted personnel of the Navy, both regular and reserve; (2) To conduct an officer candidate training program through the Naval Academy, the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps units and the Reserve Officer Candidate summer training program; (3) To furnish welfare and morale items for naval personnel; (4) To recruit Navy personnel, both regular and reserve; (5) To conduct an applied personnel research program; (6) To maintain and operate necessary facilities for the training, distribution, and administration of Navy personnel; and

the Naval Home; and (7) To administer the above programs, including maintenance of necessary Navy personnel records.

The training programs of the Navy, which comprise one of the major items in the mission of the Bureau of Naval Personnel will reflect, in 1952, the expansion of the personnel strength of the Navy which began in 1951 and will continue throughout 1952. The increased numbers receiving recruit training, basic service school training, and advanced training are directly attributable to the increased size of the Navy and to the necessity for providing trained personnel to replace Reserve petty officers who will be released to inactive duty throughout the year. Continued emphasis is being placed on functional training so that personnel may gain familiarity with new developments in technical equipment, guided missiles, underseas warfare, anti-aircraft defense, damage control, and fire fighting. The 1952 Naval Reserve training plan represents a continuation of the established program, designed to provide a nucleus of trained personnel available for prompt development in the event of mobilization.

The average number of midshipmen attending the Naval Academy will increase from 3,626 in 1951 to 3,765 in 1952. Input of regular students to the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps program has been stabilized at 2,000 annually.

Emphasis must be continued on the recruiting of Navy personnel required to meet not only the approved growth of the Navy, but to replace personnel held involuntarily beyond the expiration of enlistment, and to permit the release of Naval Reservists ordered to continuous active service during 1951. The Naval Reserve recruiting program is designed to insure planned growth, to offset the loss of members serving on active duty, and to replace losses resulting from expirations of enlistments which occur in large numbers during 1952.

The United States Naval Postgraduate School will be relocated from Annapolis, Maryland, to Monterey, California, in 1952 in order to provide a more adequate facility and to make available much needed additional space for the Naval Academy.

One additional receiving station, at New Orleans (Algiers), was reactivated during the fourth quarter of 1951 and will be operated throughout 1952 in order to provide a distribution point for personnel in the south central portion of the United States.

The following types and numbers of facilities will be maintained under this appropriation in 1952: Naval Home; Naval Academy; twelve major training establishments; eight minor training activities; two training activities in a caretaker status; four retraining commands; eleven receiving stations; 316 reserve training centers; 480 reserve electronic units; 67 berthing facilities for Naval Reserve ships; and 421 recruiting stations (17 of which have been consolidated with offices of Naval officer procurement).

The work load involved in departmental administration at the Bureau of Naval Personnel will increase proportionately with the size of the Navy and the naval establishment. It is estimated the total average number employed, both civilian and military, to accomplish this work will increase by only 5.5% while the average strength of the Navy increases by 40.5%.

The activity "Training, Navy," for which \$44,875,600 of the above requested amount is to be used, is to provide for the formal training

and instruction of 655,710 military personnel during 1952 and for necessary supporting services to complete well-rounded training programs. These personnel receive training ranging from the indoctrination of recruits, through the instruction of officers and enlisted men in the theory, operation, and application of the newest types of technical equipment and methods of naval warfare. The training program embraces postgraduate instruction in technical command, and staff areas. It provides for paying salaries of civilian professors, instructors, lecturers, and other civilian personnel; the cost of academic instruction at civilian colleges and universities; consumable supplies, educational matériels, printing, texts, and other publications; training aids and instructional equipment; related supporting costs; and the administration of an average of 112,500 correspondence courses in military subjects for Regular Navy and Naval Reserve personnel.

The funds for the training program are also designed to cover the maintenance and operation of all Navy training establishments under the cognizance of the Chief of Naval Personnel and cover the cost of improvements or alterations necessary to accomplish the missions of Bureau of Naval Personnel training activities which exist as "tenants" in establishments under the management control of other Navy bureaus or offices. The training programs under the cognizance of the Chief of Naval Personnel require the operation of 20 training establishments and provision for special support items at 42 "tenant" training activities.

The program further provides for the academic training costs of 6,819 Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps regular students. It includes the cost of academic instruction, administrative and training costs at the 52 NROTC units, technical publications for library use, and the services of a testing agency which, by conducting nation-wide examinations of applicants and evaluating their qualifications, provides a means for selective appointment on the basis of merit.

A permanent system of training and instruction in naval subjects at civilian colleges and universities is essential to provide a source from which qualified officers may be obtained for the Regular Navy and Marine Corps, and for the Naval Reserve and the Marine Corps Reserve to supplement the number of officers graduated from the Naval Academy. Fund requirements for the program are based on academic costs established by the various civilian institutions, on projections of current operational expenses of the 52 NROTC units, and on proposed contractual costs for testing services.

For the activity, "Training, Naval Reserve," there is requested \$7,983,900 of which \$2,358,300 is requested for direct training and instruction; and \$5,625,600 for maintenance and operation.

This program provides for the cost of training materials and supplies directly consumed by drilling units of the Organized and Volunteer Naval Reserve; other training media such as textbooks, training manuals and training aids; printing and reproduction; and the preparation and publication of correspondence courses in military subjects. Also included are the costs of academic instruction and books provided for Reserve officer students in the Naval Aviation College program and training materials used in the Reserve Officer Candidate program.

The program provides further for the maintenance and operation of 316 Naval Reserve training centers and the training equipment

installed therein; necessary unclassified labor; automotive costs, including the replacement of non-passenger vehicles; rental of buildings, land, and berthing facilities; support of 480 electronic facilities and stations; maintenance and repairs and maintenance dredging at Naval Reserve berthing facilities for the 104 Naval Reserve vessels.

The request of \$6,876,000 for the activity "Naval Academy" provides \$1,958,000 for direct training and instruction and \$4,918,000 for maintenance and operation. This program provides for the salaries of professors and other civilian members of the academic staff, printing and reproduction, consumable supplies and materials, training equipment required by the various academic departments, and other related training costs. It likewise provides for the administration, maintenance and operation of the physical plant at the Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland, the Naval Station, Annapolis, Maryland, and facilities expected to be vacated by the U. S. Naval Postgraduate School. It further provides for the costs of the Board of Visitors during their annual inspection of the Naval Academy.

Under the budget activity, "Personnel support," \$12,536,000 is requested for "Welfare, Recreation and Morale" and "Field operating expenses." Of this amount, \$4,470,060 is requested for the welfare, recreation and morale program, the remainder, \$8,065,940 is for field operating expenses. This program provides for leasing motion picture film for personnel aboard ships and on stations in remote areas, and for the operation of the motion picture exchange; books for ship and station libraries; commissioning allotments for welfare and recreation on newly activated ships and stations; necessary office supplies and portable equipment for Navy Chaplains; procurement of medals and awards for service, outstanding performance, and good conduct, and the engraving of medals. Also included are funds for the Navy's contribution towards the transportation of USO-type shows under a program sponsored by the Office of Secretary of Defense.

The program, "Field Operating Expenses," provides for employment of civilian personnel and operating expenses at the Family Allowance Unit, Cleveland, Ohio; the Reserve Officers Performance Recording Unit, Fort Omaha, Nebraska; the Naval Examining Center, Great Lakes, Illinois; certain offices at the District Headquarters and Naval Stations; supplies and equipment rental for Personnel Accounting Machine Installations; lodging and subsistence of the shore patrol; procurement and maintenance of band instruments for official Navy bands; printing and reproduction accomplished at the Government Printing Office; civilian clothing outfits for personnel discharged other than honorably, and other general personnel support costs.

The maintenance of a high state of morale among the personnel of the Navy is an essential function in the mission of the Bureau of Naval Personnel. Every effort is made to maintain the physical, mental, and spiritual well being of the individuals of the naval establishment, and the items supported in this program are designed to provide the maximum benefits to the Navy as a whole. The fund requirements of the various welfare programs are only partially covered by this estimate since nonappropriated funds provide the major portion of the financial support. However, these appropriated funds are essential to support the nonappropriated sources in order to meet the Navy's obligation to its personnel. Some question has been raised as to the authority for the appropriation of welfare and

recreational funds because of lack of statutory authority. Title 34, Section 542, of the United States Code provides that the profit on sales of Naval Stores of not to exceed 15 percentum may be expended in the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy under such regulations as he may prescribe for the amusement, comfort, and contentment of the enlisted force, Navy. Further attention is invited to Title 31, Section 725 s (68) United States Code in which it provides that trust funds of which "Ships stores profits, Navy" are so classified, shall be used in compliance with the terms of the trust. Since a sum not to exceed 15 percentum of the profits on sales from Ships Stores are authorized to be expended for the amusement, comfort, and contentment of the enlisted force under an equitable use of such profits to be made to the welfare of officer and enlisted personnel attached to ships of the Navy, it would appear that such authority exists.

The committee was informed that the program for recreation and welfare would cost in appropriated funds approximately \$5.24 per man and, from nonappropriated funds, approximately \$16.57 per man per year.

The request for funds for the activity, "Other personnel facilities and procurement of military personnel," for which \$16,624,000 is requested, is divided into "Procurement of military personnel" \$3,290,000 and "Maintenance and operation of personnel facilities" \$13,334,000.

This program for "Procurement of military personnel" provides for all expenses related to procurement of military personnel, including travel, lodging and subsistence of applicants; and maintenance and operation of the 421 recruiting facilities, 17 of which additionally process applicants for commissions direct from civilian life; and the production of recruiting media. No funds are included for paid advertising space, radio or television time.

The program for "Maintenance and operation of personnel facilities" is to cover various personnel facilities within the shore establishment which are under the management control of the Chief of Naval Personnel. These include receiving stations to provide distribution centers and berthing and messing facilities for naval personnel, retraining commands for the confinement of disciplinary cases, certain facilities maintained in an inactive status, and the Naval Home.

The program, "Research and Development," for which \$697,000 is requested, is to provide funds for the accomplishment of specific projects in the field of applied personnel research, both by the utilization of facilities of civilian contractors and through the services of especially qualified personnel. The projects include the development of specific naval requirements as to manpower, skills, aptitudes, training, qualifications for advancement, utilization of physically handicapped personnel and of illiterates, classification of personnel including development of necessary aptitude tests, personnel selection procedures and instruments, performance evaluation devices, the assessment of attitudes and morale, and the study of human relations in the military situation. The results of such research are urgently needed for the solution of immediate problems in the mobilization, training, and utilization of personnel.

For "Departmental Administration," a sum in the amount of \$8,110,500 is requested. Of this amount, \$7,109,000 is for "Departmental salaries," and \$1,001,500 for "Departmental operating ex-

penses". The amount requested for departmental salaries is for the employment of some 2,300 civilian employees by the Bureau of Naval Personnel at the seat of Government. Provision is made for the full time employment of 431 employees acquired during the fiscal year 1951 and for additional 4 new employees. The funds requested for "Departmental operating expenses" is to cover the costs of consumable supplies, equipment, printing, communication services and other administrative expenses required by the Bureau of Naval Personnel to accomplish its assigned functions.

The committee recommends a reduction in the requested number of civilian employees of 100 man-years due to the lag in hiring of personnel, and a dollar reduction of \$400,000, leaving for appropriation \$97,570,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

It is the purpose of this appropriation to provide funds necessary for pay, subsistence, clothing (except special clothing), and permanent change of station travel of regular Marine Corps officer and enlisted personnel. Marine Corps Reserve personnel on extended active duty with the regular forces and Marine Corps Reserve officer and enlisted personnel on continuous active duty in connection with the administration and training activities of the Reserve Program. The funds requested cover all types of pay and allowances and compensation for special duty, sea and foreign duty pay, incentive pay, unused leave pay, reenlistment bonuses, quarters allowances, severance pay, death gratuities and other duty authorized pay items. Included in the request are funds covering costs of subsistence for the above described personnel, whether in kind or in cash allowance; funds for individual clothing, initial issuances, and clothing allowances as prescribed by designated authority, and cash allowances for enlisted and officer personnel as prescribed for Marine Corps personnel.

The estimates are a mathematical application of rates of pay and allowances prescribed by law to be paid to the officer and enlisted personnel strength on active duty and expected to be on duty during the fiscal year. The estimates provide for beginning the fiscal year with 204,029 officer and enlisted personnel on active duty with a decrease during the year to an end strength of 175,516, resulting in a man year average of 192,360. Funds requested for 1952 for this appropriation total \$565,459,000.

Of the amount requested, \$86,738,000 is for the pay and allowances of all officer personnel of the Regular Marine Corps and for those officers of the Marine Corps Reserve who are on continuous or extended active duty. The average number of officers is expected to be 14,877. \$331,130,000 is to provide pay and allowances for all enlisted personnel of the regular Marine Corps and for those enlisted personnel of the Marine Corps Reserve who are on continuous or extended active duty. The estimate is based upon an average of 177,483 enlisted personnel at rates of pay provided by law.

\$56,033,000 of the requested appropriation is to provide for "subsistence in kind" for all enlisted personnel of the regular Marine Corps and for those enlisted members of the Marine Corps Reserve on continuous or extended active duty, except for those individuals who, by reason of their duty assignments, are paid cash basic allow-

ances for subsistence. It will provide subsistence in kind for all Marine Corps personnel who are subsisted in government messes.

A request for funds for "Travel, permanent change of station," in the amount of \$32,906,000 is divided into four subactivities namely (1) officers—\$1,790,000; (2) Enlisted personnel—\$20,311,200; (3) Transportation of dependents—\$7,582,800; and (4) Military sea transport service—\$3,222,000. This program provides for the reimbursement for travel to be performed by all officer personnel traveling in accordance with orders directing a permanent change of duty station; reimbursement for travel from home to first duty station upon assignment to active duty and from last duty station to home upon relief from active duty. It provides also for the travel of all enlisted personnel incident to permanent change of duty station, and for the transportation of eligible dependents of officer and enlisted personnel incident to permanent change of duty station, and for travel provided by the Military Sea Transportation Service.

Funds for "Individual clothing and uniform gratuities" in the amount of \$29,311,000 are requested; for officers, \$1,056,000 and for enlisted personnel, \$28,255,000. This program provides for the payment of uniform gratuities, as authorized by law, to certain individuals upon appointment to officer rank, together with payment of the quadrennial allowance to Reserve officers who are on continuous or extended active duty, the initial clothing allowance for newly enlisted personnel, and replenishment allowances for other personnel.

Under the request for funds for "Other individual military personnel costs" for which the request is \$29,341,000 is found "Separation costs, officers"—\$4,319,000; "Separation costs, enlisted"—\$20,652,700; and "Reenlistment bonus, enlisted"—\$4,369,300. Funds requested under this program are to defray certain costs, authorized by law, incident to the separation of officer and enlisted personnel from the service. Such items are unused leave payments, severance pay, mustering out payments, and death gratuities. Also included in the request are funds for the payment of the reenlistment bonus to personnel reenlisting in the Marine Corps for periods of three, four, or six years.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS RESERVE

This request for appropriation of \$15,145,000 is to provide funds for the pay and allowances, subsistence, clothing, and travel of the organized and volunteer personnel of the Marine Corps Reserve and officer candidate trainees engaged or participating in prescribed programs of the Marine Corps Reserve training. It covers in general the same purposes as the preceding request for appropriation for regular members of the Marine Corps with an exception that it does not cover salaries or other expenses of reservists who are on continuous or extended active duty. It does, however, include funds for drill and command pay with authorized allowances of the Organized Reserve.

The estimate is a mathematical application of pay and allowances prescribed by law to be paid under varied conditions and situations, to the various categories of authorized Reserve personnel, based upon a beginning strength for fiscal year 1952 of 2,925 officer and enlisted personnel. This strength is expected to build up during the year to an end number of 44,715, with an average enrolled strength of 23,921. It provides for a complete reactivation of the Organized Aviation

Reserve during the fiscal year 1952 together with approximately 85% reactivation of the non-Aviation Organized Reserve.

Information presented to the committee indicated that there were as of July 1, 1950, 39,747 officer and enlisted personnel in the Organized Marine Corps Reserve, that the Organized Non-Aviation Reserve was mobilized prior to September 1, 1950, and that the Organized Aviation Reserve has been partly mobilized. This accounts for the reduction of the organized reserve during 1951 to 2,925 personnel, with a resulting average enrolled strength of 11,310. By reason of this reduction in force, a saving of \$10,093,000 was realized in this program, making the base for 1952 \$7,439,000. The increase of \$7,706,000 for 1952 over the 1951 base is necessary for the purpose of rebuilding the Marine Corps Reserve.

MARINE CORPS TROOPS AND FACILITIES

The request under this appropriation title in the amount \$1,052,970,000 is to provide funds for the maintenance and operation of Marine Corps troop equipment, installations, and facilities, including items of procurement for the support of the Marine Corps and Marine Corps Reserve; for recruiting of regular and reserve Marine Corps personnel, including expenses of recruiting forces, transportation of applicants for enlistment and rejected applicants home, board and lodging of applicants for enlistment, and other recruiting costs; recreational and morale-building services for Marine Corps personnel including station libraries and library books, and motion pictures for Marine Corps personnel in remote areas; for the maintenance and operation of training schools, stations, depots, and Marine Corps Reserve training facilities (except air); for direct training costs of Marine Corps personnel and Marine Corps Reserve, including supplies and materials, contractual costs at civilian schools, purchase of instruction equipment, and correspondence courses; for the procurement, maintenance and operation of military supplies and equipment (including weapons and ammunition); automotive vehicles; including passenger carrying vehicles); fuel; special clothing; research and development; industrial mobilization; rental of buildings; medals, emblems, and insignia; departmental administration; transportation of things; movement of household goods (including contractual packing, unpacking, and local handling) of Marine Corps personnel (including Reserves on extended or continuous active duty); and all band instruments and sheet music for Marine Corps activities.

The request in the amount of \$1,052,970,000, the committee was assured, was prepared with due consideration of inventories of all supplies, equipment and materials, and tables of allowances. The appropriation provides for the maintenance and operation of all Marine Corps activities except Regular and Reserve military personnel requirements and air facilities for the Reserve. It includes the maintenance and operation of Marine barracks, depots of supplies, recruit depots, Marine Corps schools, and other types of supporting installations. It will also provide funds for fuel, salaries and wages, for the purchase, installation, and maintenance of utilities, furniture for quarters, for spare parts and repairs of motor transport equipment, and for such items of machinery, equipment, supplies, materials, and tools as are required for the upkeep of facilities. It provides for

housing and facilities, including training equipment, for all Marine Corps Reserve units (except air). Provision is made for the procurement, repair, and maintenance of electronic equipment, and for the procurement and maintenance of ordnance and ammunition. Costs of research and development of new equipment related to Marine Corps requirements are included.

"Maintenance and operation of Marine Corps facilities," for which \$197,231,000 are requested, is to provide for employment of civilian personnel required for maintenance and operation of posts, stations, and depots; and for the identification, segregation, preservation and cataloguing of stocks of materials, stores, supplies, or other public property under the jurisdiction of the Marine Corps. The Marine Corps has jurisdiction of government-owned property worth an estimated value of \$700,000,000 and, for the most part, provides for repair and maintenance thereof by station maintenance forces. It is proposed to employ approximately the same number of civilian personnel during fiscal year 1952 as was employed during fiscal year 1951. This subactivity also provides funds for the purchase of "fuel," in the amount of \$9,095,222; "upkeep of posts," \$12,499,794; "purchase, installation and maintenance of utilities," \$6,500,000; "vehicles, parts and supplies," \$98,028,000; "machinery and tools," \$4,922,091; "purchase and repair of furniture for government quarters," \$550,000; "and military equipment for Fleet Marine Force—Engineer items," \$24,650,000.

Funds are requested in the amount of \$6,336,000 to provide for repairs, alterations, and maintenance of Marine Corps Reserve Training Centers. Reactivation of organized units of the Marine Corps Reserve will require funds for repairs, alterations, and improvements to armories and other training facilities which have been held in a caretaker status. \$337,400 are requested for the operation of these reserve facilities, and \$4,484,650 for the procurement of motor vehicle equipment. Because of the reactivation of Organized Reserve units, it will be necessary to provide motor vehicle equipment to replace equipment previously in the hands of the Marine Reserve Corps but now in use by the regular forces.

Under budget activity, "General expenses, Marine Corps personnel" \$260,171,000 are requested. Uniform clothing and materials, organizational clothing, machinery for clothing factory, clothing alterations, etc., require \$64,686,000. The program provides organizational, Arctic, special cold weather, and experimental clothing, alterations to uniform clothing for personnel of the Marine Corps, and civilian clothing for personnel discharged for dishonor, bad conduct, undesirability, and inaptitude. It also provides for salaries and wages for civilian personnel, and machinery and equipment at the clothing factory in Philadelphia.

Funds in the amount of \$1,053,029, for "Supplies and services for schools," will provide tuition, educational material, and supplies for various schools where Marine Corps personnel receive instruction, namely at the Marine Corps Institute, United States Armed Forces Institute and Marine Corps Schools, Quantico, Virginia.

Funds in the amount of \$1,130,090 are requested to provide library facilities and motion pictures under the recreation and welfare program for marines in remote areas.

\$79,258,602 are requested to provide "military equipment and material for manufacture thereof." This equipment must be the best obtainable and the most modern in design to keep the Marine Corps in a state of readiness to enable them to successfully carry out assigned missions. Items proposed for Marine Corps use are tested by the Marine Corps Equipment Board to insure that they meet requirements. General supply items and various miscellaneous items are required for the Fleet Marine Force, the striking force which accompanies the fleet. The equipment factory at Philadelphia employs civilian personnel to manufacture items of equipment, and funds are required for salaries and wages of these employees. This request covers provisions for such items as, salaries and wages at Depot of Supplies, Philadelphia; drafting and photographic equipment, supplies and materials; band instruments and accessories; special training devices; equipment for test, Marine Corps Equipment Board; canvas for equipment; signal supplies, flags, wire, etc.; prizes and medals; general supply items for Fleet Marine Force; signal supply items for Fleet Marine Force; and utilities items for Fleet Marine Force.

\$50,000,000 is requested for the purchase, installation, maintenance, and restoration of electronic equipment for the Marine Corps. These funds will be used to provide, install, maintain, and restore (including spare parts) the most recent types of electronic equipment for Marine Corps units and the Fleet Marine Force to maintain them at a readiness to meet any operation of the Marine Corps.

\$4,237,885 are requested for temporary additional duty travel of Marine Corps personnel and Naval personnel with Marine Corps units. These funds provide for transportation and subsistence of these personnel while travelling on official duty. Considerable cross-country travel will be performed by such personnel in accomplishing the mission of the Marine Corps.

Funds in the amount of \$1,799,804 are requested for the "Expenses of the recruiting service," which provides funds for such activities as the Publicity Bureau, items of expense for recruits and applicants, recruiting office furniture, public information expenses, contractual advertising services, preparation of recruiting aids for radio and television release, utilities, and rental of recruiting facilities.

Funds in the amount of \$4,000,000 are requested for "Stationery, office furniture, and supplies," for the administrative operation of Posts and Stations in the field. \$15,360,000 is requested to provide for items of a general housekeeping nature, such as miscellaneous camp and garrison equipment, cleansers, pest control, mess hall and galley equipment and supplies, etc., which includes such items as disinfectants and cleansers, camp and garrison equipment and barracks furniture, mess utensils for enlisted men, ice machines and their maintenance, kitchen equipment, purchase of bed linen and mattresses, and ice for preservation of rations.

The program "Transportation of Things" is budgeted for \$17,198,350. This program provides for freight and express movement of Marine Corps equipment and supplies by commercial carrier and the Military Sea Transportation Service.

Funds are requested for the following programs:

“Water”—\$150,000

“Rent”—\$250,000

“Laundry”—\$180,000

At some stations it is necessary for the Marine Corps to purchase water used. It is the policy of the Marine Corps to use Government facilities to the maximum possible extent but where it is more economical to rent than acquire title to property, structures for quarters, storage and office space are rented. Funds are required to cover cost of laundry and dry cleaning of government-owned articles such as blankets, bed linen, rain and cold weather clothing, where Marine Corps dry cleaning facilities are not available.

Funds in the amount of \$8,522,331 are requested for “packing and crating and materials therefor.” The basis of the estimate to cover expenses of packing, crating, unpacking, storage, and hauling of household effects is a mathematical computation, based on estimated average cost and estimated personnel involved in change of station assignment who are entitled to this service. The amount requested, also, includes funds required to purchase packing materials, boxes, crates, and barrels other than for household effects.

“Miscellaneous Supplies and Expenses” is budgeted for \$139,000. These funds are required to cover the cost of horses and mules for instructional purposes and patrol in isolated areas. Funds are also required to cover burial expenses, travel of civilians (except at headquarters), and emergency expenses.

\$10,848,553 is requested to cover costs of equipment, supplies, utility services, publicity, for the Marine Corps Reserve—Ground. Reactivation of Organized units will require replacement of supplies and equipment consumed or returned to stock as the result of the mobilization of the Reserve in fiscal year 1951.

Funds in the amount of \$1,357,356 are requested for supplies and equipment such as electronic equipment, organizational clothing, office supplies, etc., required by the Marine Corps Aviation Reserve training activities. Reactivation of organized units requires replacement of supplies and equipment consumed or returned to stock as the result of mobilization of Reserve units in the fiscal year 1951.

The largest single request for funds under the appropriation “Marine Corps Troops and Facilities” is in the amount of \$477,042,000 under the activity “Marine Corps Ordnance and Ammunition” for the procurement of ammunition and the care thereof and for weapons and equipment for the Marine Corps. This program provides for the procurement and maintenance of major items of ordnance, individual arms, weapons, equipment, and prototype weapons for evaluation in amphibious warfare.

Funds in the amount of \$4,174,000 are requested for “Research and Development” related to Marine Corps requirements and covers items approved by the Research and Development Board.

Funds for Industrial Mobilization amount to \$50,000. The Munitions Board programs have been established for fiscal year 1952. The military departments are expected to support this program which provides for field employees to assist in determination of wartime requirements and preparation to obtain man power, equipment, and supply, construction of material, production equipment, etc.

Funds in the amount of \$500,000 are requested for "Cataloging". This program provides for the developing and implementing of a uniform supply system sponsored by the Munitions Board for the Department of Defense.

Funds for departmental salaries in the amount of \$5,800,130 are requested for the payment of civilian personnel at Marine Corps headquarters performing duties in connection with the procurement, discharge, education, training, discipline and distribution of officers and enlisted personnel of the Marine Corps and for the procuring, storing, and distributing of all supplies for the Marine Corps. \$1,625,870 is requested to supply the civilian personnel of the Marine Corps headquarters with stationery and office supplies, office equipment and furniture, and other administrative expenses.

Funds in the amount of \$40,000 are requested for the occupational classification of military personnel as prescribed by the Personnel Policy Board.

The committee proposes a reduction in this appropriation in the amount of \$34,850,000 due to the rescheduling of delivery time on certain vehicles, a number of the vehicles under the new program to be delivered at a later date and to be financed later.

AIRCRAFT AND FACILITIES, NAVY

The present budget estimates for the appropriation "Aircraft and Facilities" reflect generally the level of operations required for training and defense preparedness of Naval Aviation but are predicated on peacetime planning factors.

Regular Navy and Marine Corps flying and overhaul operations for fiscal year 1952 have been programmed to meet fleet and other essential requirements at a level commensurate with authorized aircraft strength and added responsibilities. Flight operations have been priced, by class of plane, at the same cost as during fiscal year 1951 but the over-all cost per flight hour is higher because of the large percentage of high-performance aircraft in fleet complements. Factors responsible for increasing aircraft operating cost likewise are responsible for increased overhaul cost.

The committee was advised that increasing numbers of high-performance aircraft are generating problems in the aeronautical shore establishment from an operational standpoint; that aircraft operating areas are becoming increasingly over-saturated as the number of high-performance aircraft in operation increases; and that the over-saturation would be alleviated somewhat during fiscal year 1952 by the opening of an additional number of satellite fields and the rehabilitation of facilities at existing fields.

The estimate for the Naval Air Reserve provides for a moderate increase in the aircraft average operating strength to restore the Reserve forces to a more acceptable level of readiness and to insure an adequacy of trained pilots to replace those ordered into active military service.

The appropriation request for "Aircraft and facilities, Navy", in the amount of \$925,393,000 is divided into 11 activities.

Activity No. 1, "Flight Operations, Regular Navy," for which \$117,834,000 is requested, finances the operation of Regular Navy and Marine Corps aircraft. Aircraft assigned to Regular Navy and

Marine Corps units are divided into carrier air groups; Marine Corps tactical squadrons and multi-purpose helicopter squadrons for support of ground forces; observation units for capital ships of the fleet; patrol squadrons to carry out reconnaissance, anti-submarine warfare and protection of shipping missions; airship patrol squadrons for coastal patrols; and those supporting aircraft, in operating status, necessary for transport, training, research and development and utility work. The request covers initial outfitting and direct operating costs of all Regular Navy and Marine Corps aircraft, both afloat and ashore. This estimate is predicated on the aircraft operating strengths and levels of flying programmed under approved plans. The direct operating costs are limited to the material components of flight operations, such as aviation gasoline, oil, technical and non-technical supplies, and equipage.

The committee was advised that the full cost of implementing the program at normal peacetime levels of supply support would be \$140,865,000 but that it had been determined to defer procurement of \$23,031,000 of aircraft spares and spare parts pending further evaluation of military programs now underway.

Activity No. 2, "Flight Operations, Naval Reserve," for which \$14,181,000 is requested, covers the direct cost of flight operations by Naval and Marine Corps Reserve aircraft in the same manner as the preceding activity provides for the regular Navy and Marine Corps. The elements included in the estimate are the same for the two activities. The committee is advised, as in the preceding activity, that the full cost of implementing this program in peacetime would be in excess of the funds herein requested by \$2,400,000. The request therefore in the amount of \$14,181,000 will leave a balance for later consideration.

Activity No. 3, "Aircraft Overhaul, Regular Navy," for which \$247,483,000 is requested is to provide for the overhaul of aircraft, engines, and other aeronautical material for the Regular Navy and Marine Corps; for the accomplishment of such related work as the manufacture of parts, emergency repairs, the maintenance of aircraft not assigned to operating squadrons or units, the recovery of usable parts from damaged and obsolescent aircraft and engines, and the conversion or modification of aircraft to perform specialized missions; and for the preservation, de-preservation, and storage of aircraft and related material. To carry out necessary functions the Navy maintains extensive overhaul and up to date repair facilities and assembly line techniques. The existence of specialized Navy facilities not only promotes economy and enhances the operating efficiency of Naval aviation, it also provides an important industrial potential in time of war when expansion of private industry to meet increased demands for production of new aircraft largely precludes extensive commercial overhaul of military aircraft. Funds requested under this estimate are primarily for labor, material, and shop expense required in carrying out the various overhaul programs in the industrial departments of the shore establishment, but include an amount for overhaul work to be accomplished under contract with private industry. As in the preceding programs the committee is advised there is a deferment in this request in the amount of \$12,576,000 pending further evaluation of overhaul requirements.

Activity No. 4, "Aircraft Overhaul, Naval Reserve," for which \$34,185,000 is requested provides for the overhaul of aircraft, engines, and related aeronautical material for the Naval Reserve in the same manner as the preceding activity provides for the aircraft overhaul of the regular Navy. This estimate, as does the preceding estimate, finances the labor, material, and shop expense in the industrial departments of the aviation shore establishment for the Naval Reserve. The distinction between the overhaul of regular Navy aircraft and the overhaul of aircraft assigned to the Naval and Marine Corps Air Reserve is primarily for purposes of accountability and fiscal control. As in the preceding activities \$2,705,000 of the required estimate has been deferred pending further evaluation of overhaul requirements.

Activity No. 5, "Station Operations, Regular Navy," for which \$155,069,000 is requested provides for normal operating and maintenance costs of regular Navy and Marine Corps Air Stations, both continental and extra-continental, such as: (1) operation of station utilities and service departments, including fiscal and supply departments, power and heating plants, sewerage disposal plants, warehouses, barracks, and fire-fighting and transportation equipment; (2) recurring day to day maintenance of runways, taxiways, hangars, shops, roads, drainage systems, utility lines, ramps, buildings, and other facilities comprising an air station; and (3) all other overhead expenses of supporting work performed in governmental establishments except for limited shop expense categories within aircraft overhaul and repair facilities.

All phases of Naval and Marine Corps air operations are directly or indirectly dependent upon station support. Shore stations serve as bases for aircraft on missions not conducted from carriers; provide overhaul, repair, and modification facilities; function as training centers for pilots and crewmen; and operate as laboratories for the development and test of aeronautical innovations designed to maintain the technical superiority of aircraft in the Naval service. These essential stations must be maintained and operated at a level of efficiency which will permit effective and adequate support to the expanding mission of Naval aviation. Since 1945 air station development has failed to keep pace with the rather unprecedented advance in the design of naval aircraft. Consequently the majority of stations are incapable of supporting continuous safe operations of high-speed jet aircraft in more than limited numbers.

The problem of small operating areas and over-crowded facilities became acute during fiscal year 1951 when air stations were faced with the task of supporting augmented forces, comprised of modern high-performance aircraft, with outmoded and obsolete facilities.

Activity No. 6, "Stations Operations, Naval Reserve," for which \$9,800,000 is requested, is to finance activities at Naval Air Reserve Stations, including recurring day to day maintenance of station facilities, operation of utilities, and other overhead functions, as indicated in the preceding activity for station operations, Regular Navy. The primary objective of the Naval Air Reserve program is to develop trained forces that can be used to augment the Regular Navy forces in the event of an emergency. Naval Air Reserve stations, which are an important part of the program, are geographically distributed to provide maximum territorial coverage within the continental limits of the United States, so as to place training facilities within reach of

present and potential Naval and Marine Corps Aviation Reservists in numbers sufficient to meet additional pilot requirements during the early stages of mobilization. These stations provide facilities and support for the Naval Air Reserve program and, in addition, constitute a ready reserve of operating facilities for the support of tactical and training activities in event of full-scale mobilization.

Activity No. 7, "Alteration and Replacement of Facilities," for which \$60,650,000 is requested covers the costs of major repairs and rehabilitation of station facilities, the installation and replacement of airport lighting systems, air navigational aid and communications equipment, and the outfitting of industrial shops with aircraft overhaul and repair equipment. The Naval Aeronautical Shore establishment is subject to continuous and costly wear and tear of property and equipment. Repairs must be timely and adequate if stations are to be maintained in the reasonably satisfactory operating condition and (ae)cumulative deterioration of facilities is to be effectively combated. The ability of the shore establishment to accomplish its assigned support mission is largely dependent upon the availability of improved types of equipment and tooling required to accommodate high-performance aircraft and upon the maintenance of the satisfactory physical condition of its operational and industrial facilities.

Activity No. 8, "Research and Development," for which \$159,729,000 is requested, is to cover the contractual costs of designing, developing, fabricating and testing aircraft, missile, power-plant and other component equipment prototypes; direct labor and direct material requirements for conducting development and test projects at Naval facilities; and support for work performed by other agencies and outside agencies from which Naval aviation will benefit directly. The committee is advised that these programs are thoroughly and continuously screened by the Bureau of Aeronautics, by the Chief of Naval Operations and by the Research and Development Board, to insure that there is a continuing need for each project planned or under way, that the desired progress is being accomplished, that adequate supporting projects have been programmed, and that all possible economies consistent with accelerated effort and efficiency of operation are being effected.

Activity No. 9, "Industrial Mobilization," for which \$6,221,000 is requested, provides for (1) Maintenance of stand by plants; (2) Maintenance and preservation of an industrial reserve of machine tools and other production equipment; (3) Development of implementation of industrial preparedness measures on a nation-wide scale for aircraft manufacturing and supporting industries; and (4) Bureau of Aeronautics' contribution to industrial mobilization planning within the Department of Defense. Each phase of the program is coordinated by the Munitions Board which has over-all responsibility for industrial mobilization functions within the Defense establishment.

Activity No. 10, "Supporting Equipment, Material, and Services," provides for Naval aviation, the necessary equipment, materials, and services not budgeted elsewhere. This activity, for which \$114,350,000 is requested, supports requirements for the Regular Navy, the Marine Corps, and their reserve components. Each of the programs included is directly related to one or more of the following factors: (1) Deliveries of aircraft and related aviation material;

(2) Aviation training; (3) Character of projected aircraft operations; and (4) Number of carriers and other fleet vessels to be operated.

Activity No. 11, "Departmental Administration," for which \$5,891,000 is requested, is to cover administrative costs of operating the Bureau of Aeronautics as distinguished from its shore and other field agencies. The mission of the Bureau of Aeronautics is the prosecution of the design, construction, test, procurement, production, maintenance, and repair of Naval and Marine Corps aircraft and related aeronautical materials, and the administration of the aviation shore establishment. This mission is accomplished largely through the efforts of civilian personnel working under the direction of the chief of bureau and his staff of Naval assistants. Of the above amount, \$5,500,000 is requested to cover salaries of civilian employees who carry on the extensive and diversified functions of the Bureau of Aeronautics, with the exception of those employees engaged in work directly pertaining to the new aircraft program. The salaries of these latter employees are paid from the appropriation "construction of aircraft and related procurement, Navy." The remaining \$391,000 of the request is to cover the bureau's requirement for expendable supplies, equipment, local and long-distance telephone services, postage, and related costs.

The committee recommends a reduction in this request of 500 man-years of civilian employment and a dollar reduction of \$2,000,000. It is felt that this program will not suffer in any material way by reason of this modest reduction in civilian personnel.

CONSTRUCTION OF AIRCRAFT AND RELATED PROCUREMENT, NAVY

The appropriation under this activity is to provide funds for the procurement of aircraft, guided missiles and target drones, including ordnance, initial spares, and related equipment, and for the procurement of technical aviation equipment for service training for the Navy and Marine Corps and their reserve components. It also will provide for modernization of aircraft in inventory.

The funds provided for construction of aircraft determines to a large extent the strength of Naval aviation and the rate of aircraft procurement which governs the mobilization potential of the aircraft industry. The committee is advised that the present request for procurement for new aircraft is based on the planned operating strength, specific combat complements, attrition, obsolescence, and normal aircraft service life. The request for funds herein is to cover deliveries of aircraft of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps and their reserve components through December 1953. It is necessary to provide for deliveries through that date because of the long production lead time involved in the manufacture of modern aircraft. In addition to aircraft and related ordnance, the appropriation requested herein covers the cost of procuring guided missiles and target drones for evaluation and operational use; for providing production models of new aeronautical equipment for technical training; and for modernizing service aircraft. Although significant progress has been made in the past several years in the guided missile field the present estimate for guided missiles is restricted to limited production quantities of missiles for tactical evaluation and flight testing. All target drones which are budgeted for in the instant request, however, are service

models for fleet operation use. The total request for appropriations under this heading in the amount of \$4,022,476,000 may be divided for purposes of understanding into three amounts as follows: \$3,498,-910,000 for new aircraft and production tooling and facilities; \$73,566,-000 for other related procurement; and \$450,000,000 to provide the cash for payment of prior contract authority.

The "Aircraft Procurement Program" Activity No. 1, provides the new aircraft required each year, not only for the replacement of aircraft loss by attrition but, more importantly, for the timely introduction of new and improved models into regular service use. The aircraft procurement program should provide for the introduction of new models with such timing that when an existing model becomes obsolescent it can be replaced by modern aircraft of superior performance. Equally important is the effect of the current rate of aircraft procurement on the mobilization potential. One of the most serious problems, should widespread hostilities occur, would be the delay involved in expanding aircraft production to the required emergency level. A high level of peacetime procurement improves the speed of aircraft mobilization in two ways: first, it increases the number of new aircraft available at the onset of hostilities; and second, it shortens the time span required to attain the peak aircraft production level required by the service to fulfill its wartime missions.

Activity No. 2, "Ordnance for New Aircraft", for which \$49,056,000 is requested provides funds for procurement by the Bureau of Ordnance of guns and fire-control equipment, including spares and spare parts, to be installed in aircraft procured in this estimate. Aviation ordnance equipment under the technical cognizance of the Bureau of Aeronautics is included with all other component equipment under the aircraft procurement activity.

Activity No. 3, "Guided Missile and Target Drone Procurement," for which \$33,425,000 is requested, is to finance the procurement of production quantities of guided missiles and target drones. Development of guided missiles and target drones is financed under the "Research and Development" activity. Quantities for service use and after successful development of a prototype, evaluation quantities in excess of ten, are manufactured on a production basis and accordingly are budgeted as a responsibility of the appropriation herein considered under this activity. The employment of guided missiles as an offensive and defensive weapon represents a significant departure from established techniques. Missiles may be launched from and employed against aircraft, ships, submarines, and ground installations. Missiles procured under this activity are used for flight test and tactical evaluation, functions which involve operations under a variety of difficult and hazardous conditions in order to proof and perfect the missiles and to develop techniques in their usage. Target drones are required by the fleet for gunnery training and for development of new offensive and defensive techniques and countermeasures. Foreign developments in the field of jet-propelled aircraft and missiles have made it mandatory that the fleet be furnished high-performance target drones if adequate offensive and defensive firing techniques are to be developed and personnel trained in these techniques.

Activity No. 4, "Technical Equipment for Service Training," for which \$10,938,000 is requested, is to provide new types of aviation technical equipment for use in the various technical service schools

and to defray contract costs of factory training for service personnel. Aviation technical training service schools provide (1) basic instruction, to prepare enlisted men for the duties of the lower aviation petty officer ratings; (2) advanced instruction, to qualify petty officers for advancement in rating; and (3) specialized instruction, to prepare officers and men to operate and maintain special types of technical aviation equipment. Specialized training in the operation and maintenance of the latest types of equipment is essential prior to the introduction of modern aircraft and accessories to service use. It also is an important part of the education provided all Naval and Marine Corps personnel both Regular and Reserve, who are to be assigned to aviation duty in an age of rapidly increasing technical complexity.

Activity No. 5, "Aircraft Modernization", for which \$29,203,000 is requested, is to cover the procurement of electronic and electrical equipment and peculiar spare parts for the conversion of service aircraft to specialized configuration and for the modernization of service aircraft, without basic configuration change, through installation of improved electronic equipment. Modernization is essentially the process of making aircraft in the fleet capable of operating with new aircraft coming off the production line. Electronic and electrical equipment in older aircraft must be replaced, as technical advances take place, with the new equipment employed in modern warfare to insure an acceptable degree of military readiness. The basic necessity for modernizing Naval aircraft arises from the demonstrable fact that advances in the electronic field habitually render obsolete the original equipment installed in the aircraft before the latter's useful life is over. In addition, there is a marked tendency to accomplish with automatic electronic systems functions heretofore performed by the pilot. The magnitude of the over-all requirements of this program may be more readily understood when it is realized that the cost of electronic equipment has arisen from 7 percent of the cost of a World War II airplane to 18 percent of the greatly increased cost of today's model.

The committee recommends an appropriation for this appropriation of \$4,000,000,000, which reflects a reduction of \$22,476,000. The appropriation may be reduced by such amount due to lag time in procurement and by closer supervision of the procurement of aircraft, production tooling, and related procurement.

SHIPS AND FACILITIES

The appropriation "Ships and Facilities, Navy" provides funds necessary for the maintenance and operation of ships of the Active Fleet, Reserve Fleet, and the Naval Reserve. It includes funds for expenses of shore facilities that provide the support necessary for maintenance and operation of these vessels. It also pays for research and development related to the improvement of ships and ship equipment.

The justification for this appropriation in the amount of \$1,605,424,000 was presented to the Committee broken down into ten activities.

Activity I is "Maintenance and Operation of the Active Fleet." Under this activity, the amount requested is \$642,279,000 to be expended for the purpose of keeping the ships in the Active Fleet in an acceptable state of material readiness and combat efficiency and

for the re-activation of some 93 Reserve Fleet ships. Fifty-five of the 93 ships are scheduled for reactivation in private yards at an estimated cost of \$16,626,000.

Funds are requested in a subactivity, "Repair of Ships—Labor and Navy Stock Account Material" in the amount of \$176,994,000, to maintain the Active Fleet in a state of combat readiness and for the maintenance of 1,162 Active Fleet ships and 1,100 active service craft. The funds provided under this subactivity include funds for the overhaul of 555 ships and the reactivation of 38 ships in naval shipyards during the fiscal year 1952. All costs relative to this activity are computed upon the basis of experience and analyzed cost returns. The division of costs of labor and naval supply account material in this subactivity are estimated to be 80% for labor and 20% for materials.

In support of the above program, under the subactivity "Repair of Ships—Components," presented to the Committee, there is recommended an amount of \$101,740,000 for specialized equipment, other than electronics, required for maintenance purposes aboard Active Fleet vessels. Very substantial inventories are required to be carried for these purposes and the Committee was advised that some \$100,000,000 worth of material from the inventory was used throughout fiscal year 1951. The present request is based upon anticipated usage of materials by fleet personnel in the accomplishment of routine maintenance aboard Active Fleet vessels, expected usage during regular overhaul, and the procurement of newly developed items. For "Repair of Ships—Repair Parts" under this activity, an appropriation in the amount of \$126,100,000 is recommended to cover the replenishment of estimated stock issues to be made during the fiscal year 1952, the repair of material in store, and the procurement of non-standard material for naval shipyards and laboratories. The estimated cost of issues during fiscal year 1951 was \$110,000,000. The increase requested above this amount is due to a greatly expanded operating fleet including vessels to be re-activated and the increased number of steaming hours and increased cost. It is not believed that the funds herein provided will increase the present inventory but are sufficient only to keep a satisfactory inventory and offset costs of material issued from inventory.

For "Repair of Ships—Repairs in Private Yards", \$16,626,000 is requested to provide for the re-activation of 55 ships by private contractors.

For the subactivity "Alterations and the Material Improvement Program—Labor and NSA Material", \$83,050,000 is requested which is to provide for the continuation of a program designed to install, on all Active Fleet vessels, where materials are available and to the maximum extent practicable, those alterations designated as mandatory for national security and essential to the combat readiness of the augmented Active Fleet. Included in the program are funds for contractual services, labor, and incidental material necessary to the accomplishment of alterations and material improvement in hull, machinery, equipment, and fittings of vessels of the Active Fleet, including, first, electronics and ordnance installations affecting the military characteristics of the ship; second, modification of ordnance equipment installed aboard naval vessels; third, modifications to shipboard installations, arrangements, and material affecting the

efficiency of operation of ships; fourth, modifications required to protect the safety and health of operating personnel; and fifth, installations essential to operational evaluation by forces afloat of newly developed materials and systems.

In the subactivity "Alteration and Material Improvement Program—Components," an amount of \$8,000,000 was requested to provide specialized materials, other than electronics, for the accomplishment of alterations designated as mandatory for national security and essential for the improved combat readiness of vessels for which no procurement has as yet been initiated or which will be approved for procurement during fiscal year 1952. Items under this recommended appropriation are for improvements rather than repairs. Such components are of a technical nature and are purchased for specific alterations to vessels. Because of their complexity and extended manufacturing lead time, it requires that contracts be let some 18 to 36 months in advance of scheduled use.

Under the subactivity, "Supplies and Equipage," funds in the amount of \$49,509,000 are to provide consumable supplies, equipment, and services in sufficient quantities to support the ships in the Active Fleet and to outfit the ships that will be added to the Active Fleet by new construction, by conversion, or by re-activation during fiscal year 1952 with the proper supplies and equipage. It is anticipated that the full allowance of supplies and equipage will be maintained on board each ship. The increased operational schedule for fiscal year 1952 will result in increased quantities of the materials to be used by the ships.

Funds for the subactivity "Salvage" in the amount of \$1,000,000 are to provide for immediate initiation of salvage operations in the event of loss of a naval vessel, but are not intended to provide for major salvage operations. They will provide services to vessels and for the maintenance repair, replacement, and procurement of ship salvage and submarine salvage equipment.

Funds for the subactivity "Charter and Hire" in the amount of \$1,500,000 will provide for the hire of commercial vessels required by increased operational schedules. No funds are provided for emergency operations under this heading such as occurred in the Far East during fiscal year 1951.

In the subactivity "Arming of MSTs Vessels," funds in the amount of \$7,530,000 are requested for the arming of 25 tankers and cargo ships under the control of the Military Sea Transportation Service. It is proposed that these ships be civilian manned but receive Naval Armed Guard crews and that the work of arming these vessels will be accomplished in commercial shipyards with such naval shipyard assistance and technical guidance as may be necessary.

The request for \$33,000,000 for the subactivity "Production Facilities for Components," to provide for the tooling and production equipment required in the establishment of a second or additional source of supply for certain specialized equipment, other than electronics, required to adequately maintain the Fleet in the event of mobilization. From the amount requested it is proposed to transfer \$8,620,000 to "Facilities, Navy, 1952" to be used for the purpose of establishing the additional source of supply herein required.

In the subactivity "Alteration of Military Sea Transportation Service Vessels," funds in the amount of \$34,500,000 for the alteration of 59 passenger transports or troop ships for the military Sea Trans-

portation Service are to provide for modifications of such vessels to adapt them to maximum troop lift and the installation of Meccano decking on tankers. The work will be accomplished in commercial shipyards. The Meccano decking is a portable decking installed above the main deck at approximately the catwalk level to provide space for carrying cargo. The adjustable nature of the structural components will permit the shipment of any size cargo from assembled planes to small crates with minimum increase of structural topside weight.

Funds in the amount of \$2,730,000 for the subactivity, "Arming of Coast Guard Vessels," are to provide for the installation on board 101 Coast Guard vessels of certain urgently required armament and equipment of a higher classification to improve their usefulness in escort and anti-submarine service. The program of arming and improving Coast Guard Vessels is held as a matter of high priority by the Chief of Naval Operation. This is considered an expense properly chargeable to Navy appropriations since these vessels are being fitted for missions over and above their normal peacetime functions and the work is being done under Navy specifications.

Budget activity No. 2, "Maintenance and Preservation of Reserve Fleet," requires funds in the amount of \$64,556,000. In large part, it provides the same service to the Reserve Fleet that activity No. 8, explained above, does for the Active Fleet. Of the total funds requested, \$54,273,000 are for repair of ships; \$5,674,000 for alteration and material improvement program; \$3,500,000 for supplies and equipment; and \$1,109,000 for inactivations. Of the funds provided for "Repair of Ships," it is estimated that \$19,305,000 will be expended for repairs in private yards. It is proposed that a continuation of quinquennial overhauls of approximately 20% of the Reserve Fleet vessels be made during fiscal year 1952. It is also proposed to continue the periodic and control drydocking program, coordinated with the quinquennial overhaul program of the Reserve Fleet. Maintenance of Reserve Fleet vessels by military personnel assigned to the Reserve Fleet will be continued. One aircraft carrier and two escort carriers will be activated and maintained in a "Ready Reserve Status" in the Reserve Fleet. Maintenance and preservation of "Out of Service in Reserve" craft assigned to Naval District Commandants will be continued.

Budget Activity No. 3, "Cataloging and Standardization," is a program of cataloging and standardization that has been in progress for some five years. Funds in the amount of \$2,100,000 are provided to cover the amounts for "Cataloging, Naval Establishment," \$700,000; "Cataloging, Munitions Board," \$200,000; and "Standardization," \$1,200,000. It is expected that the early part of the fiscal year 1952 will see the practical completion of identification work within the scope and priority of the Naval Establishment for stocks currently on hand. The ship's allowance list program on the new format will be continued. It is expected that by the end of fiscal year 1952 the greater portion of the Active Fleet allowance lists will be completed. Upon completion of the allowance lists for Active Fleet vessels the work will be continued for vessels of the Reserve Fleet.

The Munitions Board cataloging program, as in the past, contemplates the establishment of one system of cataloging to be used by all departments of the Department of Defense with the ultimate objective

that each item of supply used, purchased, stocked, or distributed shall be identified under one name card and description, assigned only one identification number, and classified in but one commodity classification system. The single item characterization will then be used for all functions of supply from original purchase to final field distribution in and among all military departments. The practical completion of the identification work should materially reduce the cost of this program. The standardization program provides for standardization of materials, equipment, test methods, and inspection procedures, and for inter-departmental coordination of standardization of components for electrical and electronic equipment. The \$1,200,000 provided for the standardization program is broken down into two items of which \$900,000 is to cover standardization of materials, equipment, and test and inspection methods and procedures; and \$300,000 for the Navy's share of the support of the Armed Services Electro-Standards Agency.

Budget Activity No. 4, "Electronics," under the appropriation title "Ships and Facilities, Navy" covers the requirements for procurement of electronics equipment, for servicing the equipment, and for certain production facilities. The total amount herein recommended for this activity is \$441,583,000. Of this amount, \$42,630,000 is for shipboard electronics maintenance and covers all costs of material, testing equipment, and engineering services for the maintenance and operation of the Active Fleet and Navy owned electronic equipment on board Coast Guard vessels. Such items include electron tubes; maintenance repair parts and components; test equipment used in the maintenance of shipborne electronic equipment; and the contractual services of civilian engineers who assist in such maintenance. During fiscal year 1951 a large scale procurement of standardized tubes and parts was initiated which has reduced the net requirements for funds during fiscal year 1952. Additional maintenance funds are being provided herein for replacement components, expendable items, and test equipment which will be required for the additional vessels being reactivated. For maintenance and operation of electronic equipment on shore an amount of \$4,400,000 is included. This program provides for expendable electronic materials and the maintenance of electronic testing and other equipment installed at Bureau of Ships activities, such as naval shipyards and laboratories.

The program for major procurement of electronics equipment indicates a requirement in the total amount of \$322,553,000 which includes electronic equipment for the improvement of the Active Fleet and Reserve Fleet and for the Bureau of Ships' contribution to the training of Naval personnel. The Committee was advised that in June 1949 a study was made by the Bureau of Ships of electronics equipment required at that time for the Active Fleet to meet technical and operational commitments. The total dollar value of those requirements was estimated at \$568,965,500 of which about \$68,000,000 was for equipment now being budgeted for by other appropriations. That left an estimate of approximately \$500,000,000 for the Active Fleet. Since 1949 the Active Fleet has been greatly expanded, increasing the \$500,000,000 estimate as of that time to about \$900,000,000 as of the present date. During the current fiscal year there will be obligated some \$461,208,000 for new electronic equipment. The \$322,553,000 provided herein will be applied to the remaining deficiency and, in

addition, as directed by the Chief of Naval Operations, will be used for the more urgently required electronics items for a portion of the Reserve Fleet.

The detailed electronic equipment requirements are based on a computation of types of equipment to meet the military requirements for Naval vessels established by the Chief of Naval Operations for each type of vessel in the Active Fleet. Prototype or experimental models required by the new construction and conversion program are not included in this budget estimate. Included herein are only those electronic equipment programs which have been or will be evaluated for production quantity procurements during Fiscal Year 1952 and have been approved by the Office of the Secretary of Defense. These schedules are in consonance with a planned level-off production program, approved by the Secretary of Defense, which can be maintained for the duration of the present emergency and which in the event of full mobilization can be expanded most efficiently.

Funds in the amount of \$72,000,000 for production facilities for components is for the expansion and conversion of commercial plant capacity for production of basic electronic components for military utilization. It is proposed to transfer \$12,525,000 of this amount to "Facilities, Navy, 1952".

Budget Activity No. 5, "Research and Development", has a requirement for a total of \$76,538,000 of which \$29,658,000 is for "Research and development, general", and \$46,880,000 for "Research and development, electronics". The purpose of this program is to provide new and improved design and operational features for ship's machinery, materials, and equipment, including electronics, to insure maximum combat effectiveness. The wide variety of items needed to carry out such an over-all program requires a careful balancing of the conflicting demands to achieve the necessary integration of research and development efforts. This coordination is accomplished through the channeling of all efforts in terms of the operational requirements established by the Chief of Naval Operations in line with Research and Development Board categories. An aggressive program of research and development is mandatory to keep abreast of scientific advances and to bring our ships to the highest obtainable standards of efficiency and provide a Fleet capable of meeting requirements of international commitments. New techniques of warfare make it necessary to improve constantly the strength, weight characteristics, speed, defense features, and effectiveness of our ships. Therefore, we must lead in new developments and be first in the utilization of the results of all scientific and technological advances in their application to national defense.

Budget Activity No. 6, "Maintenance and Operation of Shore Facilities", under the appropriation "Ships and Facilities, Navy", requests an appropriation of \$234,762,000 to finance the maintenance and operation of naval shipyards including maintenance of buildings, grounds and structures; maintenance and replacement of industrial, automotive, weight-handling, and railway equipment; maintenance and operation of waterfront facilities, including floating industrial equipment; and the maintenance, procurement, and replacement of production tools and plant equipment necessary to perform industrial work, modernize outmoded equipment, or to keep abreast of technical improvements. This activity provides for support costs and plant

improvements at 11 naval shipyards and at other shore facilities including the Bureau's research and test laboratories. It also provides for advanced base materials and equipment for schools and harbor defense.

Of the total request of \$94,365,000 for maintenance and operation of shipyards, \$75,405,000 is for routine maintenance and operation of shipyards; \$1,520,000 for the procurement of new and replacement of railway equipment; \$6,760,000 for the procurement of new and replacement of automotive equipment; \$10,360,000 for deferred maintenance items removed from the Public Works appropriation and non-recurring maintenance items at naval shipyards deferred because of lack of funds, time, or labor in prior years; and \$320,000 for scheduled re-activations and overhauls of floating industrial equipment and related service craft at naval shipyards.

The Committee feels that the Bureau of Ships has made good progress in breaking out overhead costs and assigning them to productive work accomplished for other activities. This effort should be diligently pursued to the end that the true costs of ship construction, overhauls, activations, and other work may be readily ascertained.

The \$44,273,000 requested for expenditure under the subhead, "Maintenance and Operation of other Shore Stations", is to provide funds for certain field activities to enable them to accomplish their mission of support to Active and Reserve Fleets and to ships assigned to the Naval Reserve. Such field activities include Submarine Bases, Reserve Fleet Berthing Areas, Industrial Managers and Ship Repair Departments at Naval Stations, Major Command Headquarters, Sea Frontiers, and Fleet Commands. The functions and sub-programs which this estimate will support are (1) maintenance and operation of field installations in support of fleets, \$37,756,000; (2) military travel at fleet activity commands, \$314,000; (3) military travel of returnable quotas to schools, \$895,000; (4) procurement of new and replacement automotive equipment and materials-handling equipment, \$1,220,000; (5) non-recurring major maintenance items deferred due to lack of funds, labor, or time, \$1,020,000; and (6) scheduled re-activations, inactivations, and overhauls of floating industrial equipment and related service craft, \$3,068,000.

There is included in this estimate also under "Maintenance and Operation of Shore Facilities" \$12,991,000 for the purpose of stockpiling advance base material in appropriate Navy warehouses in order that material will be available in support of Fleet operations in advanced areas. Such advanced base material is stockpiled in units so that each unit is a complete base. Recent directives have increased the number of advanced base components and materials required to be on hand by the end of fiscal year 1952.

The amount of \$32,900,000 requested herein for the maintenance and operation of laboratories is to provide the necessary funds for overhead costs at Bureau of Ships' laboratories. The funds will include pay for indirect costs of productive work such as annual leave, sick leave and holiday pay at such laboratories.

For inspection testing there is provided \$1,225,000 for testing of materials and equipment for compliance with procurement specifications for serviceability and operational evaluation and for type and brand approval.

Funds in the total amount of \$3,746,000 for general equipment for school sare included herein to provide material for instruction of Naval personnel in regular Navy schools; to provide the costs of furnishing ship models, simulated structures, sectionalized equipment, and so forth used for training and exhibition purposes; cost of training films, on operation, maintenance, and repair of Bureau of Ships' equipment. There are approximately 200 regular Navy training activities to which this program renders support. The estimated value of the currently existing ship models is \$5,500,000. The films produced under this program have a Navy-wide use in training operators and technicians at established schools, aboard ship, and fleet activities.

Funds in the amount of \$15,903,000 for equipment for schools—electronics—are for the purpose of providing electronic material required for operational and maintenance instruction of naval personnel in regular Navy schools. Sonar and radar equipment, when used in operational training, frequently requires special electronic target generation equipment to provide realistic controllable signals either not obtainable by "live" means or obtained only by uneconomic assignment of aircraft, vessels, and crews. Funds to cover procurement of such training aids and systems are included in this estimate.

A certain number of superliners, merchant ships, and cargo vessels now under construction are earmarked by the Navy to be converted to troop ships and combatant vessels in the event of full mobilization. Funds in the amount of \$1,250,000 for this purpose are provided herein for the preparation of design plans and specifications for converting such vessels.

Funds in the amount of \$20,260,000 are herein provided for harbor defense to cover the cost of procurement, maintenance, and operation of continental harbor defense material other than electronics material. For the "Harbor Defense" (electronic) program there is provided \$7,849,000 to procure electronic equipment for the defense of continental and overseas harbors.

Budget Activity No. 7, "Maintenance and Operation of Naval Reserve Vessels", under the appropriation title "Ships and Facilities, Navy", requests a total of \$26,783,000 and is to provide the labor and Naval Stock Account material required for repairs and overhaul of the hull, machinery and ordnance of the 104 ships assigned to the Naval Reserve training program to be accomplished at naval shipyards. Such repairs are necessary as the result of normal wear, tear, and ravages of the elements. To a great extent expenditures from this program govern the material condition and combat efficiency of the reserve vessels of the Navy combat potential. The program of bringing the 104 vessels up to and maintaining them in a maximum state of combat readiness will enable them, if required, either to join the Active Fleet or otherwise perform anti-submarine warfare patrols and escort duties. Other objectives of the program which will require the repair of more ships in this fiscal year than during the past fiscal year is the acceleration from the training program to a maximum practicable extent; ammunition expenditures of 150 percent of normal rate; the replacement of nine destroyers by escort destroyers and 5 minesweepers by submarine chaser types from the reserve fleet.

Components for the repair of Naval Reserve vessels for which \$1,000,000 is requested, is to provide specialized equipment of a

technical nature required for maintenance purposes aboard the vessels assigned to the Naval Reserve training. As a part of the Naval Reserve training these vessels must be maintained in the best possible state of material readiness. Funds requested hereunder provide for the procurement of operating and subsidiary equipment vital to satisfactory training and required in the accelerated program of maintenance.

The program covering repair parts of Naval Reserve vessels for which \$4,000,000 is requested is to cover the cost of procurement for the replenishment of inventories withdrawn from the Ships Parts Supply System. The increased request for funds for this program more nearly reflects the actual cost of the material withdrawn from the supply system. In previous years funds for this activity have not been sufficient to cover the estimated cost of repair parts but have been issued from inventory as required and not replenished.

Labor and Naval Supply Account matériel for alterations and matériel improvement program of the Naval Reserve vessels, for which \$2,822,000 is requested, is to provide for labor and incidental material necessary for the accomplishment of alterations and improvements in hull, machinery, equipment and fittings of Naval Reserve training vessels. A recent change in the intended future utilization of vessels assigned to the Naval Reserve training program under which such vessels are considered as an essential component of the Naval combat potential requires that they be maintained at a high state of material readiness. Under such considerations it is necessary to accomplish improvements which will make them satisfactory for operation with the active fleet as well as a limited number of modifications essential to the satisfactory instruction and training of personnel.

Components for the alterations and matériel improvement program for which \$200,000 is requested provides special equipment other than electronics required for accomplishment of alterations and improvements in the hull, machinery, equipment and fittings of Naval Reserve vessels. These components are of a technical nature and similar to those required for vessels of the active fleet. •

Funds in the amount of \$1,664,000 for supplies and equipage provide the numerous items of consumable supplies, equipment, and services used aboard ship in day-to-day operations and maintenance. To mention a few, there are swabs, brooms, paint, etc., used for house-keeping; tools, canvas, bolts, pipe, and other materials used by ships' crews in affecting emergency and other repairs; lube oil and grease for machinery; stationery, stamps, and other office supplies; tug and pilot hire; and dockside services as required in foreign ports. The funds requested for this purpose will provide such supplies, equipment and services in sufficient quantities to support the 104 ships assigned to the Naval Reserve training program.

The request for \$1,750,300 for equipment for shore facilities, general, is to finance the Bureau of Ships' material, except electronics, required for instruction of Naval Reservists at Naval Reserve training activities. The specific responsibilities of the Bureau of Ships in this connection are first, provision of new equipment and cost of installation; second, modification, major repairs, and replacement of equipment; and third, construction of ship compartment mockups, fire-fighting structures, and simulated ship structures. There are 317

Naval Reserve Training Centers and 27 Naval Air Stations, and Naval Air Reserve Training Stations to which this program renders support. Support of this program largely determines the ability of Naval Reserve training activities to carry out assigned functions of training Reservists in the operation and maintenance of Bureau of Ships' equipment.

The request for \$1,925,200 for electronics for Naval Reserve vessels is to provide for the maintenance, installation, and procurement of electronics equipment at approximately 763 Naval Reserve shore electronic activities, Naval Air Reserve training units, and Naval Reserve Training-Centers. All types of radio, radar, sonar, and test equipment are provided.

Funds are requested in the amount of \$196,500 for electronic equipment for ships which is to provide for the procurement of electronic equipment for use on Naval Reserve vessels such as radio, radar, and sonar.

The sum requested under Budget Activity No. 8, Industrial Mobilization, in the amount of \$29,724,000 includes funds for the maintenance of facilities in some 128 reserve plants in the Department of Defense reserve; acquisition, modernization and preservation of machine tools and industrial equipment and storage of war reserve tools; initiation and continuation of ships construction and conversion planning programs, and educational contracts with industry for production tools, jigs, fixtures, and items necessary for rapid acceleration of production in the event of an emergency; and the computation of wartime requirements, allocation of production capacity, industrial security, purchase of bills of material, and development of security plans for facilities and resources.

Funds for the reserve plants will provide for normal maintenance in 21 plants and shipyards, engineering surveys in 6 plants and shipyards, annual inspections of department reserve plants and naval industrial reserve facilities, deferred maintenance in 16 plants and shipyards, modernization in 2 plants, capital deferred maintenance items in one plant, Naval Industrial Reserve Shipyard, Ambridge, Pennsylvania, Naval Industrial Reserve Shipyard, Kearney, New Jersey, and repairs at Erie Forge Company, Erie, Pennsylvania.

The funds requested for the acquisition and modernization of machine tools and industrial equipment in the amount of \$11,853,000 will provide for the processing of some 300 tool, heavy machine tool; rehabilitation and reconditioning of approximately 300 large production tools; provide large molds and production equipment for producing large laminated hull and frame members for wooden mine sweepers and other harbor craft; to increase the capacity of certain private plants to enable them to provide special tools and equipment to manufacture hull plates, of which there are no commercial production to government specifications; to purchase long lead time industrial equipment; to continue dynamic dehumidification storage and preservation of tools until they are required for actual production; and to modernize 54 machines to make them more efficient for production of new shipbuilding items.

Budget activity numbered 9, "Fuel for Ships," under the appropriation title "Ships and facilities, Navy" in the amount of \$72,988,000 is to provide for the procurement of fuel, water, and utility services for ships of the Active Fleet. The amount herein requested is \$1,932,-

000 less than the amount provided for the same purpose for fiscal year 1951. The major portion of these funds are for the procurement of petroleum products. It does not appear that the requirements for petroleum products will be less during fiscal year 1952 than during the preceeding fiscal year. The fact that the estimate did not appear to be a realistic one was called to the attention of representatives of the Department of the Navy who stated that this request was to be reconsidered some time next fall in the light of conditions that would then exist. Under these circumstances the Committee has not recommended an amount in excess of the amount requested.

Budget activity numbered 10, "Departmental Administration," under the appropriation title "Ships and facilities, Navy," requests an amount of \$14,111,000. Funds under this program are to provide the manpower for the Bureau headquarters in Washington, D. C. The Washington Bureau is a central technical office responsible for initiation, direction, coordination, and consultation in an almost unparalleled variety of engineering and scientific operation. The Bureau consists of a large number of small specialized technical sections each dealing with a particular facet of ship design or with a particular type of ship. Information presented to the Committee indicated that for these purposes, for fiscal year 1951, 2,050 manyears of labor would be required. For 1952 the estimates are 2,695 manyears of labor to carry on the work of this Bureau. It was stated to your Committee that during the years following World War II the Bureau reduced its staff too far and too fast, and that during recent years the design complexity of the modern naval vessel has increased in rapid progression. Recent developments and a greatly increased workload found the Bureau inadequately staffed. It is further stated that the estimated manyears for 1952 are not considered adequate, but are considered the maximum obtainable due to difficulty in recruiting and training a qualified staff. It was represented that the workload and backlog situation in the Bureau is serious and will materially increase during the fiscal year 1952 because of additional volume of work imposed on the Bureau by the rearmament program. Of the \$14,111,000 requested for this activity, \$12,230,000 are for departmental salaries and \$1,881,000 are for other departmental expenses, such as office supplies, materials, equipment and services, such as repairs to furniture, fixtures, and equipment, rental of office equipment, printing and reproduction, library and translation services, communications and microfilm services, travel of civilians and temporary additional duty travel of officer personnel.

The committee recommends a reduction in this appropriation request of \$67,972,000 to be applied against production and by the elimination of 1,000 manyears of civilian employment. The committee finds no fault with the program but finds that experience on the length of time required to manufacture some of the items of equipment was lacking at the time the estimates were made and recent production indicates some inaccuracies in original schedules. This recommended reduction by the committee will not impair the program.

CONSTRUCTION OF SHIPS

The request for appropriation under this heading totals \$77,353,000 of which \$55,961,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority heretofore granted under this head. The remain-

ing \$21,392,000 is to cover the repricing of the 1951 program. The limitation upon the total of obligations that may be incurred under this item of appropriation for construction, conversion, or replacement approved after July 17, 1947, is increased in the amount of the appropriation herein requested for the repricing program, making an over-all total limitation of \$1,085,663,000.

Under this program 311 ships and 113 landing vehicles are authorized for construction or conversion, not including 5 ships for construction and 12 for conversion provided for in the Fourth Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951. At the close of fiscal year 1950, 60 ships were authorized of which 18 were for construction and 42 for conversion. During fiscal year 1951 new programs were authorized covering the construction of 77 ships and the conversion of 174, a total of 251, and the construction of 113 landing vehicles.

The committee was informed that no new shipbuilding program is being requested under this appropriation title. Appropriation requests for currently planned, and future programs, are to be made under a new appropriation "Shipubilding and Conversion, Navy."

SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION

This is a new appropriation title proposed to cover shipbuilding and conversion expenses. The appropriation request contained herein of \$1,343,297,000 is to provide for the construction of 113 new ships and the conversion of 198 existing ships. Tonnage authorizations for this program are contained in Public Law No. 3, 82nd Congress, and prior acts. It is also proposed to transfer to this new appropriation \$137,000,000 of funds provided in the Fourth Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951, for the construction or conversion of 17 vessels, authorization for which is also contained in Public Law 3. The foregoing programs, in total, amount to \$1,480,297,000.

The committee was informed that under this appropriation item most of the new construction is to be performed in private yards since the Navy shipyards will have a full workload in keeping the Active Fleet in repair and operating condition.

INCREASE AND REPLACEMENT OF NAVAL VESSELS

The request for an appropriation of \$45,000,000 under this heading is for the purpose of continuing the liquidation of outstanding obligations against this wartime appropriation. The principal expenditures anticipated in fiscal year 1952 are those in connection with continuing the construction of the Northampton and Timmerman, still under construction at the Bethlehem Steel Company plant in Quincy, Massachusetts, and the Bath Iron Works plant in Bath, Maine, respectively. In addition to the continuing construction on the two vessels named there will be expenditures which must be provided for on other vessels of the wartime program which involve final settlements and payments for delayed charges. The entire appropriation herein requested is to take care of expenditures of this nature.

ORDNANCE AND FACILITIES, NAVY

The request under this appropriation title of \$1,347,668,000 is for the purpose of providing funds for research and development in the

field of naval ordnance; for production and procurement of ordnance and ammunition, including costs of inspection (except ordnance for new aircraft, new ships, and ships authorized for conversion); for maintenance of ordnance and ammunition, except installation, maintenance and removal of ship's ordnance and line maintenance of ordnance installed in aircraft; for alteration, preservation and handling of ordnance and ammunition; for re-work of ammunition; for surveillance of ordnance and ammunition; for maintenance, operation, improvement and alteration of facilities in the ordnance shore establishments; cost of commercial communications, supply and fiscal operation, photographic equipment and supplies; for procurement of equipment, supplies, special clothing and services; for lease of facilities; for cost of transportation of material on procurement to first destination; for industrial mobilization; for cataloging and standardization; for procurement of plant equipment, appliances, and machine tools; and installation thereof in naval or private plants; and for departmental administration.

The above appropriation is broken down into nine activities as follows: (1) "Research and Development," \$126,955,000 (2) "Procurement of Ordnance and Ammunition," \$881,504,000 (3) "Maintenance of Ordnance and Ammunition," \$150,185,000 (4) "Maintenance and Operation of Facilities," \$68,522,000 (5) "Improvements and Alterations, to Facilities," \$87,386,000 (6) "Cataloging," \$1,848,000 (7) "Industrial Mobilization," \$21,558,000 (8) "Naval Reserve," \$1,177,000 (9) "Departmental Administration," \$8,503,000.

Under Activity No. 1, "Research and Development," for which the request is \$126,955,000 it is proposed that the major emphasis will be placed on research and development projects related to air defense, anti-submarine and combat air support operations. The shift of large segments of these programs and other program projects of ordnance and facilities to an emergency level basis will require an increase in funds in order to insure the earliest possible availability of improved ordnance equipment and materiel for service use.

Under Activity No. 2, "Procurement of Ordnance and Ammunition," for which request is made in the amount of \$881,504,000, it is represented that the program reflects two significant changes from prior year estimates. Namely, one, ammunition for naval shipbuilding and conversion projects formerly funded in continuing shipbuilding appropriations which now will be funded in this appropriation. It is represented that this change in content will greatly increase the total ammunition requirement against which funds in this appropriation must be used. Two, in general, the funds requested for procurement of ammunition are sufficient only to insure uninterrupted production during fiscal year 1952 and for several months in fiscal year 1953. Of the overall amount requested in this appropriation, it is represented that \$149,374,000 will be required for the procurement of ammunition; \$86,864,000 for the procurement of mines, depth charges, nets and degaussing; \$41,335,000 for the procurement of torpedoes; \$89,834,000 for the procurement of guided missiles; \$362,097,000 for the procurement of ordnance equipment; and \$152,000,000 for facilities to expedite procurement.

Activity No. 3, "Maintenance of Ordnance and Ammunition," for which \$150,185,000 is requested, will be required to support the increase in operating levels of supply, the increase and accelerated

programs for arming combat and non-combat vessels which entail substantial withdrawals of equipment and material from current inventories, and a more accurate appraisal of current issues of ordnance material. It provides for labor, material, technical services, and spare parts, for maintenance, modernization and improvements of ordnance equipment. Such equipment whether installed in the fleet, in shore installations or in store must be maintained and kept in a condition that will insure effective readiness. This activity likewise provides for modernization, rehabilitation, and maintenance of ammunition on hand as well as that which may be returned from overseas areas. It also provides for maintenance of Quality Evaluation Laboratories and the procurement of additional facilities and equipment required by the performance of quality control and surveillance functions necessary to effectively carry out the assigned programs under this activity. This program also includes funds for advance base components under present approved mobilization plans.

Activity 4, "Maintenance and operation of facilities." Under the appropriation "Ordnance and Facilities, Navy," for which request is made for \$68,552,000, is broken down into eight subactivities as follows: (1) Maintenance and operation, \$50,127,000; (2) Supply and fiscal, \$12,500,000; (3) Photographic equipment and supplies, \$1,350,000; (4) Communications, \$700,000; (5) Packing of household effects, \$500,000; (6) Public school support for which no funds are requested in the 1952 estimates; (7) Support of overseas bases, \$3,000,000; and (8) Procurement and maintenance of radiac, \$375,000.

The first subactivity is Maintenance and Operation for which \$50,127,000 is requested. It is proposed to use such funds for the routine maintenance and operation of ordnance facilities such as ordnance research stations, manufacturing plants, ammunition depots, storage and servicing installations which are needed to provide essential ordnance and ordnance service. Routine maintenance includes the physical upkeep and repair of railroads, roads, buildings, grounds, locomotives, rolling stock, vehicles, and other facilities, and equipment as well as purchase of minor capital equipment not otherwise budgeted for but essential for the effective operation of a maintenance force. This program also provides for security, and fire protection of the ordnance shore establishment.

It is understandable that the rapid rise in workload and personnel following the outbreak of hostilities in Korea and the planned expansion has created a considerable impact on the facilities of the ordnance establishment. Many of the facilities, including equipment, have received little or no maintenance since the conclusion of World War II. In addition to the large initial outlay required to ready such facilities and equipment for service, the intensive day to day maintenance which will be required is still a further item to be provided under this program. This applies to buildings which have been closed off with all services disconnected, to railroads and roads which have not been used and have become impassable, to deadlined construction equipment, automotive vehicles, locomotives, railroad rolling stock, and even to grounds where drainage facilities were not maintained. This estimate includes \$153,000 for tenant joint-user expenses in connection with the cost of ordnance departments at naval stations. It also includes \$734,300 for maintenance and operation of rental housing

at activities supported by this appropriation and \$1,675,000 for the payment of social security taxes. It likewise provides for wage increases of from 7 to 17 cents per hour granted to most per diem workers, increased amounts of overtime work by maintenance personnel, and increased amounts for security and fire-fighting personnel.

Subactivity 2, Supply and fiscal, provides funds for the management functions at each station financed under this program. These functions include the maintenance of all records for the procurement, receipt, storage, and shipment of supplies, material and equipment, maintenance of inventory and accounting records, the preparation of accounting, personnel, and work measurement reports, and the preparation of civilian and military payrolls.

Subactivity 3, Photographic equipment and supplies, provides funds for the procurement of photographic equipment and supplies used by the ordnance research stations for research, development, and evaluation purposes. The acceleration of research and development on such items as rockets and guided missiles require various types of conventional and specialized photographic equipment as well as large stocks of supplies such as film, paper and chemicals.

Subactivity 4 is for communications in the amount of \$700,000 and provides for the cost of commercial communications in the shore establishment including tolls and lease lines.

Subactivity 5, under which an amount of \$500,000 is requested for the packing of household effects, would provide for the packing, unpacking, and local handling of household effects of Navy personnel involved in permanent change of station, where the responsibility for providing these services in the area is assigned to the activity of the Bureau of Ordnance. The principal activity of this Bureau providing such services is the Naval Gun Factory, Washington, D. C., which serves all naval personnel in the Washington, D. C., area.

Under Subactivity 6, Public school support, no funds are requested.

Subactivity 7, Support of overseas bases, for which \$3,000,000 is requested, is for the support of overseas bases and includes the support of ordnance facilities and functions at overseas bases such as loading, offloading, and storage of ammunition.

Subactivity 8, Procurement and maintenance of radiac equipment, is for the purpose of procurement and maintenance of an initial station allowance of radiac equipment. This is a new item for which the request totals \$375,000.

Activity No. 5, "Improvements and Alterations to Facilities", under the appropriation title "Ordnance and facilities, Navy" requests a total of \$87,386,000. This amount is divided among ten subactivities as follows: Subactivity 1, Alterations to grounds, for which there is requested \$18,370,000 is for the performance of functions under this program such as nonrecurring alterations, replacement, repair and rehabilitation of railroads, railroad facilities, roads, fences, docks, piers, mooring basins, soil erosion control and related projects for the efficient operation of the Shore Establishment and protection of capital investments in such properties. The committee was informed that the Ordnance Establishment has within its operation 1,460 miles of railroads, 619.6 miles of which are to be repaired with funds provided in this request. One of the principal uses for the railroad in the Ordnance Establishment is the conveyance of critical items of ammunition and ordnance material, and the handling

of explosive materials. The movement of such material has increased in volume some 500 percent during the past year. Railroad rehabilitation projects included in this program cover only the highest priority requirements at 16 naval ammunition depots, 5 naval ordnance plants, 3 magazine and net depots, and 7 others in a total amount of \$12,700,000. In addition to this amount, \$2,000,000 is requested for soil erosion projects which require the improvement of slopes and drainage at naval ammunition depots to prevent accidental explosions.

Requests in the amount of \$3,206,220 is made for repair of station roads. The Bureau of Ordnance has a total of approximately 1,622 miles of bituminous surfaced roads in the Shore Establishment. These roads have not been kept in good repair for the past several years. Sections of roads in their present condition will not support the increased load, traffic and further delay of repairs and replacement work will increase progressively the total cost of such repairs and replacements at some future date. Rehabilitation projects included in this program cover only the highest priority requirements.

Subactivity 2, Health, sanitation, fire-protection, safety and security projects, for which \$1,882,095 is requested is, to provide for the installation, repair and improvement of facilities for safety, sanitation and security at the ordnance establishments. A large percentage of personnel employed at ordnance stations are performing functions which are classified in the hazardous occupation category. The safety record in the Bureau of Ordnance is good and can be maintained only by providing safe working conditions for the personnel.

Subactivity 3, operational economies, for which \$1,108,595 are requested for the purpose of providing alterations and improvements to existing structures and utilities and minor construction of new buildings or relocation of utilities which will result in a savings of manpower or material. In other words, it is represented to the committee that these funds will make it possible to make improvements to structures and utilities which will result in clearly demonstrable economies in operation. Examples of such projects are the insulation of buildings to reduce the amount of fuel required for heating; the installation of a freight elevator to provide for efficient handling of materials; improvements and extensions to administrative areas to provide for centralization of administrative functions; construction of small permanent facilities to replace temporary facilities which are uneconomical to maintain; and replacement of temporary or otherwise inadequate utilities to provide of conservation of electricity and water.

Subactivity 4, storm damage, under which funds in the amount of \$757,000 are requested is to provide for repairs of structures and facilities which were damaged by storm which occurred 23-25 November 1950.

Subactivity 5, deficiencies in structures and utilities, under which a request for \$10,317,200 is to correct deficiencies in structures and utilities, will provide for the repair and rehabilitation projects at approximately 40 stations in the ordnance shore establishment. Approximately 50% of these funds will be used for major projects at the Naval Gun Factory, Naval Ammunition Depot, Oahu, and the Naval Magazine at Port Chicago. The committee was informed that 32 buildings at the Naval Gun Factory require repairs of an essential nature. Continued delays in the accomplishment of minor repairs

during the past few years has created a serious backlog of major maintenance projects. Of the 219 structures at the Gun Factory, approximately 75% of the buildings were constructed prior to World War II. The productive capacity of the Naval Gun Factory is essential to the meeting of production schedules on critical types of weapons and the projects required under this program are basic to the efficient operation of the factory, therefore the urgent requirement for correction of the deficiencies just mentioned. The funds would also provide for completing the rehabilitation of varicated sidings at the Naval Magazine, Port Chicago. Also for adequate ventilation and moisture control in underground magazines at the Naval Ammunition Depot, Oahu; rehabilitation of magazines at the Naval Magazine, Guam, and various other rehabilitation projects which involve the replacement of temporary wartime materials used during World War II.

Subactivity 6, Maintenance and procurement of advance base equipment, for which funds in the amount of \$3,655,500 are requested for maintenance and procurement of advance base equipment is to provide for the maintenance and procurement of the equipment required for ordnance components to support the currently authorized advance base program.

Subactivity 7, equipment at other than ordnance stations, for which \$750,000 is requested to provide for the ordnance handling equipment at stations not under the cognizance of the Bureau of Ordnance, such as fork-lift trucks and other special trucks at Naval stations, Naval operating bases, and Naval air stations. The workload at these activities entail the handling of ordnance essential to servicing of aircraft and ships.

Subactivity 8, Rehabilitation and furnishing household units, for which funds in the amount of \$280,110 are requested is to provide for the conversion of selected low-cost rental housing units to public quarters.

Subactivity 9, Vehicles (non-combat), for which funds in the amount of \$12,028,000 are requested is for the procurement of non-passenger carrying automatic equipment. The committee was advised that some 3,083 trucks, 833 station vehicles, and equipment used to handle explosives were required in connection with the increased program for fiscal year 1952. It is proposed to turn in a like number of trucks and special vehicles, all non-passenger carrying vehicles, used in excess of 7 years by the department and which have exceeded the maximum economical life expectancy and repair costs to maintain the vehicle in operating condition have become excessive in terms of replacement costs.

Subactivity 10, Railroad construction and materials handling equipment, for which \$38,237,500 are requested is to provide for the procurement of non-passenger carrying automotive, railroad, and construction and material handling equipment for the ordnance shore establishments. The ordnance establishment has need for approximately 6,600 non-passenger carrying automotive vehicles to operate at the levels required to adequately support the operating forces. At the present time about 4,768 vehicles are in operating condition. The committee was informed that within the past 6 months 1,793 vehicles in poor condition have been placed back in service to temporarily meet station requirements. Over 80% of the 6,561 ve-

hicles on hand have been used over 7 years. The funds requested will provide only for replacement of vehicles and will not increase station inventories.

In Activity 6, covering "Cataloging," under the appropriation title "Ordnance and facilities, Navy" the total sum of \$1,848,000 is requested. Of this amount \$1,570,000 is for cataloging and \$278,000 for standardization. The cataloging program is composed of the following major projects:

(1) Article identification and stock numbering which includes all technical research necessary prior to stock numbering and the determination of equivalents and interchangeability between items in order to effect, where possible, the substitution of one item for one or more others.

(2) Identification and recording of ammunition which is required in order that the Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance may properly discharge the duties assigned to him by the Secretary of the Navy in connection with the storage and issue of ammunition.

(3) Compilation of ordnance sections of catalogs. Information developed through article identification and standardization is completed in prescribed format for inclusion in the ordnance section, catalog of Navy material.

(4) Navy ordnance allowance list provision. This program is designed to accomplish standardization of Naval ordnance allowance list as performed; to reduce quantities of materials to be carried, both ashore and afloat, through the elimination of unnecessary and duplicating items in allowance lists; and to conserve space and weight aboard ships.

(5) Compilation of revised allowance lists.

(6) Munitions Board cataloging agency program. The Bureau of Ordnance participates in a program designed to provide a uniform supply cataloging system for the Department of Defense and other agencies of the Federal government.

(7) Maintenance of a technical library.

(8) Art work and layout.

(9) Printing and binding.

The standardization part of the program, for which \$278,000 is requested, includes the development, recording, publication, and promulgation of standardization agreements among the bureaus of the Navy, the services of the Army and the Air Force in the fields of engineering standards, equipment standards, material standards, process standards. In the fields just mentioned, particularly those of engineering standardization and equipment standardization, the Munitions Board has established programs which require the active participation and support of all branches of the national Military Establishment including the Bureau of Ordnance. Specifications program contemplates the establishment and maintenance of a single series of purchase documents to be known as military specifications, that will describe each item of supply purchased by the military establishment, except items covered by Federal specifications. The integration of all procurement specifications into a single series of military specifications will eliminate existing burdensome and conflicting requirements, thus simplifying procurement, production and distribution.

Activity 7 covers "Industrial Mobilization," under the appropriation title "Ordnance and facilities, Navy", for which \$21,558,000

is requested. Subactivity 1, Reserve Plants, has a request for \$515,000 to provide for the normal maintenance, inspection and security of inactive reserve plants and for rehabilitation and modernization of those inactive plants in reserve which will be activated in the first year of mobilization. A majority of reserve plants have been reactivated. Two reserve plants remaining in an inactive status will require limited modernization on the physical plant structures in order to rehabilitate these plants during fiscal year 1952. Modernization of plant equipment will include the acquisition of new machine tools and plant equipment items to replace those of old design.

Subactivity 2, Machine tools and production equipment, under Industrial Mobilization has a request for \$5,343,000 for the acquisition of industrial production equipment such as gauges, and special gauge equipment, tool testing and calibration equipment, manufacturing aids, and long-leadtime items of machine tools and production equipment. Items to be procured under this program are highly specialized in nature, such as electronic production equipment, cold extrusion presses, heading presses, heat treatment furnaces and related equipment. In order to broaden the industrial mobilization base and have sufficient quantities of the above types of machines on hand to meet production requirements, the Bureau of Ordnance contemplates procuring these machines commercially. In view of the long leadtime required to make these machines, procurement must be initiated at the earliest possible date.

Subactivity 3, Industrial preparedness measures, under which \$15,200,000 is requested, is for the purpose of providing funds for improved measures for the elimination or reduction of critical materials in the production of military items for which there will be substantial requirements; measures designed to accomplish basic production planning for those critical military items; measures for the establishment of production lines; measures concerning newly developed items for which volume production techniques will be needed; measures for the completion of projects already underway; and measures for the improvement of the productibility of items or for the improvement or development of manufacturing processes and of process and final inspection methods. These funds are requested to continue projects now underway with early promise of successful completion and for additional projects of high priority in the mobilization planning of the Bureau of Ordnance. It was stated that increased emphasis will be placed on the joint Army, Navy pilot line for mobilization production of cold-extruded projectiles.

Subactivity 4, Inter-departmental planning, contains a request for funds in the amount of \$500,000 to support the field inspection services for services rendered for the Bureau of Ordnance in connection with total industrial mobilization planning which will be necessary to meet the cost of the requirements program, production allocation program, and the industrial security preparedness program.

Activity No. 8, "Naval Reserve", under the appropriation title "Ordnance and Facilities, Navy", in the over-all amount of \$1,177,000 is for procurement, and the installation and maintenance of spare parts for the Naval Reserve. The committee was advised that the average number of Naval Reservists at the end of fiscal year 1951 would be approximately 150,000, this number will be increased during fiscal year 1952 to approximately 194,000. The program for procure-

ment, for which \$500,000 is requested, is to provide for ordnance equipment and preparation of ammunition required for the Naval Reserve program, and will be used for the preparation of practice bombs and ammunition for gunnery practice. The program for the installation and maintenance of spare parts for which \$677,000 is requested, provides for the installation of guns, mounts, fire control, radar and other ordnance equipment and spare parts for the maintenance of such equipment at the Naval Reserve training centers and for training vessels. There are 99 vessels assigned to the Naval Reserve training program; 110 Naval training centers, which have ordnance equipment installed, are considered complete; 37 additional Naval Reserve training centers will have their ordnance installations completed by the end of fiscal year 1952, leaving 10 planned installations uncompleted. The funds requested herein represent approximately .03 percent of the value of the equipment to be maintained.

Activity No. 9, "Departmental Administration," under the appropriation title "Ordnance and Facilities, Navy," for which \$8,503,000 is requested is to provide for the payment of personal services, civilian travel, temporary duty travel, civilian dependents transportation, rental of office equipment, communications, printing and binding, and the numerous items required to support departmental headquarters activities. The program for personal services, for which \$5,295,000 is requested, provides for the payment of salaries of departmental employees at the seat of government. Some of the activities of these employees include the procuring or providing for production of ordnance, directing the maintenance, overhaul, stowage and issue of ordnance ashore and afloat; conducting and coordinating research and development projects to improve and find new applications for existing ordnance and to develop new defensive and combat weapons; directing the operation of the ordnance shore activities; and providing financial, administrative, inspection and other services as required. Present and projected requirements have placed upon the Bureau of Ordnance additional requirements in procurement, research, maintenance, and other programs. Such requirements necessarily call for highly skillful planning to obtain effective use of existing production facilities, to expand those existing facilities and to establish new facilities to meet required delivery schedules. Employees of this Bureau are required to perform work of great diversity and complexity and of the utmost importance to the security of the nation since a proper discharge of their responsibilities is essential to the combat effectiveness of the Navy. It is most essential that this Bureau provide sound production specifications, negotiate contracts wisely, provide adequate engineering guidance and direction, and establish necessary inspection control to realize the greatest value for each tax dollar expended. A total number of permanent positions of approximately 1,300 will be required to perform these services for fiscal year 1952.

\$1,390,000 is requested for travel of civilians, civilian dependents, and temporary duty travel of military personnel. These funds will provide for the per diem and travel expenses of civilian and military personnel in the departmental and field offices and for the transportation of dependents of civilian personnel who are transferred at the convenience of the Government to, from, and between departmental

and field offices. Travel funds are necessary to provide for attendance of technical personnel for observation of tests and to attend conferences concerning them; to provide personnel to advise and assist in performing ordnance and fire control work in shipyards; to provide direction, consultation, advice and appraisal on contracts awarded to industrial and governmental establishments; assist companies in working out satisfactory production schedules; consult with various field installations regarding organizations, procedures, personnel, and budget, and recommend and take action to improve administrative management; to maintain foreign liaison in connection with naval policy on standardization of arms and equipment; recruit and transport civilian personnel to their duty station; and transport military personnel from their duty station to schools and return.

The committee wishes to admonish the Bureau that the expenditure of travel funds should have the closest supervision. In many instances some other form of communication may be sufficient in the transaction of the business at hand and at a savings of time and funds. Consideration should also be given to the combining of missions so that one person may perform several duties while in a travel status.

Numerous other items under this activity such as communications, rental of office equipment, printing and binding, furniture and equipment, accident prevention, postage, and taxes and assessments of approximately \$2,000,000 cover the usual requirements in the administration of a department comparable to the Bureau of Ordnance. The requests are slightly higher than for the fiscal year 1951 but not outstandingly so.

The committee recommends a reduction in this appropriation of \$12,000,000, of which \$2,000,000 is to be applied against the use of 1,000 man-years of civilian employment through more economical use of the remaining employees, the remaining reduction of \$10,000,000 is recommended due to lag in procurement and rescheduling of program to effect a more economical procurement of the required items.

ORDNANCE FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION

The request for \$52,445,000 for "Ordnance for new construction, Navy", is for the purpose of providing funds for the liquidation, during fiscal year 1952, of obligations incurred under contract authority provided in 1948, 1949, and 1950 shipbuilding programs. This appropriation title was established by Public Law 202 of the 80th Congress in fiscal year 1948 in order to separate the fiscal transactions of the post-war shipbuilding program from World War II programs. The shipbuilding programs under this appropriation have been established in conformity with the policy that new types of ships must be built and existing ships converted in order that the Navy may advance with scientific progress, and to initiate by annual increments a shipbuilding program which will provide ships of the required types in the required numbers to maintain continually a balanced fleet capable of coping with present world conditions. Ship construction and conversion programs of 1948 and 1949 have been carried on under contract authorization granted in those years. This contract authority has been partially liquidated by annual appropriations since 1948. The 1950 shipbuilding and conversion program was started under a combination of contract authorization and appropriated funds. In

fiscal year 1951 appropriations were made to continue liquidation of contract authority previously granted and to provide complete funding of new programs authorized under this title during that fiscal year. Funds requested herein, however, are only for liquidation in 1952 of obligations incurred under contract authority provided in the 1948, 1949 and 1950 shipbuilding programs.

ORDNANCE FOR SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION

This is a new appropriation title the general purposes of which are to provide for the construction and procurement of armor and armament for vessels constructed or converted under the appropriation "Shipbuilding and Conversion"; to provide the necessary tools and equipment specifically necessary for the above purposes; and to provide for the pay of personnel in the Bureau of Ordnance whose duties are specially concerned with the procurement and construction of armor and armament for the above purposes.

During the period of World War II and until fiscal year 1948 the procurement of armor, armament and ammunition for ships constructed, acquired or converted by the Navy was financed under the appropriation "Increase and replacement of Naval Vessels (Armor, armament and ammunition)". In fiscal year 1948 and through the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951, ordnance and ammunition for ships included in the Navy shipbuilding programs during that period were financed in the appropriation "Ordnance for new construction, Navy". This new appropriation request represents the establishment of a new additional appropriation to finance the ordnance requirements for ships included in the fiscal year 1952 shipbuilding and conversion program and for 17 ships funded in the 1951 Fourth Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951. It is proposed that this appropriation serve as the funding medium for these and subsequent programs. A significant change in the content of this appropriation is the removal of ammunition allowances in the estimated cost of ship projects in the 1952 and subsequent Naval shipbuilding programs. Allowances of ammunition were previously funded as a part of the ordnance cost of such projects, but as now proposed, they will be financed in the annual appropriation "Ordnance and Facilities, Navy". The estimated cost of the program to be inaugurated under the present request is \$431,390,000. The expenditures from the requested appropriation are expected to be made over a period of six years as follows: 1952—\$33,619,000; 1953—\$96,070,000; 1954—\$110,676,000; 1955—\$131,787,000; 1956—\$52,717,000; and 1957—\$6,521,000. The funds requested herein will provide for costs of major items of ordnance equipment as outlined in the program for 118 vessels to be constructed and for the conversion of 210 vessels.

INCREASE AND REPLACEMENT OF NAVAL VESSELS, ARMOR, ARMAMENT, AND AMMUNITION

This is a wartime appropriation which financed the production and procurement of armor, armament, and ammunition for vessels built under wartime shipbuilding programs. The general purpose of the appropriation was (1) to provide for the construction and procurement of armor, armament and ammunition for vessels constructed or con-

verted under the appropriation "Increase and Replacement of Naval Vessels, Construction and Machinery"; (2) to procure the necessary tools, equipment, land, and facilities specifically necessary for the above purposes; (3) to provide for the pay of those personnel in the Bureau of Ordnance whose duties are specifically concerned with the construction and procurement of armor, armament, and ammunition for vessels constructed, acquired, or converted under this appropriation; (4) to provide pay for travel of personnel whose travel duties are specifically concerned with the construction and procurement of equipment and material under this appropriation; and (5) to provide for transportation costs, to first destination, of material on procurement.

In order to separate the fiscal transaction of this wartime program from those of the postwar shipbuilding programs, the continuing appropriation "Ordnance for New Construction, Navy" was established by the Congress effective with the fiscal year 1948.

The Bureau is currently completing work on transactions under this appropriation. These transactions consist of the liquidation of obligations for ordnance equipment procured for vessels completed and for vessels now being constructed under the appropriation "Increase and Replacement of Naval Vessels (Construction and Machinery)". The Bureau is also making additional obligations for ordnance for vessels still under construction. Under the provisions of Public Law 434, 81st Congress, this appropriation lapsed for obligation purposes on June 30, 1951, and will lapse for expenditure purposes on June 30, 1952. Considerable activity related to the completion of the programs financed in this appropriation remains and it is now apparent that deliveries of and expenditure payments for certain items will be delayed beyond the expenditure expiration date. It is now anticipated that it will be necessary to request an extension of expenditure availability upon submission of the 1953 budget request. Present estimates are based upon the premise that such request will be granted and the Bureau of Ordnance is endeavoring to speed up production in order that deliveries of these items will be made at the earliest possible date. Production and procurement of ordnance material and equipment for approximately 56,000 ships has been acquired under this appropriation at a total cost of approximately \$5,513,467,000. There remains to be funded approximately \$27,656,000 of which \$12,656,000 is requested for expenditure during the fiscal year 1952.

MEDICAL CARE, NAVY

This appropriation for which \$136,545,000 is requested provides for medical and dental care of personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps, including the maintenance and operation of a medical center, hospitals, medical supply depots, medical department schools, medical research facilities, dispensaries and dental clinics, and such allied functions as instruction of medical personnel, medical research, care of the dead, and procurement of medical supplies and equipment. This appropriation does not include the pay of military personnel, nor the cost of maintenance and non-medical supplies, equipment, and services for medical facilities at shore establishments (except naval stations) and ships. It is anticipated that the patient load in naval hospitals for the fiscal year 1952 will average 22,973

patients; Veterans Administration patient load in naval hospitals 585; Army patients in naval hospitals 510; Air Force patients in naval hospitals 330 and that the Navy will have in non-naval hospitals a total average of 577 patients. Included in the estimate are funds for non-recurring procurement of medical stores to meet program objectives for mobilization reserves covering items which cannot be obtained from industry within the time required upon mobilization. The appropriation request is broken down into ten activities.

Subactivity 1, "Research and Development" for which \$3,391,000 is requested for direct costs is to provide funds for all expenses directly related to the accomplishment of medical and dental research and development projects. For administrative purposes, the research projects of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery are divided into the basic fields of naval medicine and dentistry. Included in the basic field of naval medicine are projects in the sub-fields of atomic medicine, physiology, aviation medicine, preventive medicine, therapeutics, psycho-physiology, submarine medicine, field medicine, tropical medicine, psychiatry and psychology. The basic field of dentistry includes projects in the sub-fields of therapeutics and preventive medicine. The research and development review board of the Chief of Naval Operations assigns ceiling funds for the program. Specific amounts for specific projects are determined by the Bureau of Medicine in accordance with priorities established by the Research and Development Board. The research and development request—direct cost—is divided into two parts; for research \$3,230,400 and for development \$160,600. The indirect costs of this program require \$920,000 to provide for all indirect costs of medical and dental research programs being carried on in the Bureau of Medicine facilities, other naval facilities, and other government facilities. It also provides for the Navy's prorated share of maintenance costs of the Armed Services Medical Procurement Agency development facilities. It is divided as follows: research \$910,000; development \$10,000. Indirect costs are those costs which cannot be readily identified with a single research or development project, or which benefit more than one project. Included are general administrative salaries, utilities, general supplies and equipment, and maintenance.

In Activity 2, "Maintenance and Operation of Medical Treatment Facilities" for which \$49,129,000 is requested for hospitals and \$839,000 for dispensaries and clinics is to provide for medical care in naval hospitals of active duty naval and Marine Corps personnel and other persons authorized by law to receive such care on an anticipated patient load of 22,973. Plans contemplate the operation of twenty-nine hospitals in full operating status and one hospital in maintenance status, at Aiea, Territory of Hawaii; and for personal services, supplies, equipment and services for necessary maintenance and operation of two naval dispensaries, and five naval dental clinics under the management control of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery. Personal services at hospitals in the amount of \$32,571,661 are anticipated; subsistence \$15,730,815; medical stores (central procurement) \$9,667,000; and other maintenance and operation in the amount of \$10,953,524 which totals \$68,923,000 are in excess over the amount requested. This amount is reduced by the amount of reimbursements in the amount of \$19,794,000. Personal services at naval dispensaries and dental clinics account for \$144,932 of the request;

medical stores \$428,000; and maintenance and operation for \$266,068 making a total of the \$839,000 requested for this purpose. These dispensaries and dental clinics provide out-patient services only to service and eligible supernumerary personnel. Hospitalization cases are transferred to the nearest naval hospital.

In activity 3, "Departmental Administration" there is requested \$2,090,000 divided as follows: Personnel services, \$1,573,900; temporary active duty-military, \$130,000; civilian travel, \$10,000; communications, \$25,800; rental of office machines, \$26,000; printing and reproduction, \$244,000; supplies and services, \$49,700; and furniture and equipment, \$30,600. In fiscal year 1952, 462 civilian employees are requested to perform essential duties throughout the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery. Approximately 50 percent of this number will be required to conduct physical qualifications, medical records, medical statistic and medical personnel programs. For example, work to be processed in the medical records operation varies directly with the number of Navy and Marine Corps personnel. Likewise, the work load in physical qualifications depends directly on the review of physical examinations of men entering the service. The volume of medical statistical work is directly related to the incident of sickness and disease among naval personnel. The remaining 50 percent of the personnel will be required for work relating to the establishment and maintenance of high professional standards in medicine, surgery, and related fields including the direction of programs on sanitation, industrial health and communicable diseases; medical and dental facility planning and expansion to meet increased requirements; direction and coordination of medical research and development including justification of and accounting for all naval medical funds; and execution of administrative controls and services required for operating the bureau. Travel funds are required for expenses plus per diem allowances for civilian employees of the bureau and professional consultants for travel to field activities to perform duties and assist in coordinating and improving Medical Department operations. The communications funds are required to provide essential communications services in conducting bureau operations. In addition to phone services required for local business, the Bureau, as the home office of the Medical Department, must maintain close contact with the various field activities either by telephone or field trips. Funds requested for the rental of office machines provides for the collecting, compiling, and analyzing detailed medical statistics on sick and wounded naval personnel by use of machine methods. Funds for printing and reproduction work provide for cost of publications produced by the Armed Forces Medical Publications Agency. The estimated cost of these publications is \$158,000. The remaining \$86,000 is required for forms, pamphlets, and publications in conducting the programs and operations of the bureau. The request for funds for supplies and services is for the purpose of providing supply items and services required by the bureau during fiscal year 1952. Funds for furniture and equipment are to provide file cases, typewriters, desks, chairs, book cases, and other furniture and equipment required throughout the bureau.

The request for funds for Activity 4 "Education and Training" in the amount of \$3,610,000 is divided into the following subactivities: personal services \$1,072,679; training films \$153,000; centrally pro-

cured medical stores \$95,000; and other maintenance and operation \$2,289,321. This activity provides funds for maintenance and operation of nine Medical Department schools which are dispersed to provide training near centers of induction and in locations where qualified training personnel and adequate equipment are readily available. Provision is also made for procurement of training films which are used as audio-visual aids in the instruction of personnel. Under this program funds are provided for civilian lecturers and consultants and other professional personnel on a contract basis for the instruction and scientific training of Medical Department personnel; in addition, it provides for such types of civilian personnel as clerks, typists, and stenographers; also for maintenance and operating costs and medical store expenses to insure an adequate training program for specialized instruction of medical and dental officers, Medical Service Corps officers and enlisted personnel of the Hospital Corps to maintain high standards of professional care. The schools operated by the Medical Department train enlisted personnel of the Hospital Corps in methods and procedures for care of the sick so that they may be qualified to perform their duties and assume increased responsibilities; for training Nurse Corps officers in hospital administration; and for post-graduate training of medical and dental officers in various professional specialties. The training films are required to insure an adequate audio-visual training program for the instruction of Medical Department personnel; also for instruction of all other personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps, on such subjects as health education, accident prevention and communicable disease control.

The request in the amount of \$8,742,000 for Activity 5, "Medical Services, Supplies and Equipment at other Facilities", is to provide funds for civilian personnel in the amount of \$424,266 centrally procured medical stores \$8,025,000; and for other maintenance and operation \$292,734 which provides for personnel on ships and at station dispensaries which are under the management control of other bureaus. These station dispensaries provide necessary medical and dental care for service personnel and eligible supernumeraries, as well as providing health service for civilian employees to the extent authorized by law. This activity provides for dispensary type care, consisting principally of treatments and examinations in the form of out-patient care. In-patient care is also provided for minor illnesses of short duration, which do not warrant admission to a naval hospital. A chest X-ray program is also administered, which has been extremely successful in the early detection of tuberculosis and other diseases of the chest.

The request for \$59,800,000, in Activity 6, for non-recurring procurement of medical supplies and equipment is broken down as follows: medical stores \$48,760,000; blood substitutes program \$1,250,000; blood plasma stock-pile \$5,580,000; rehabilitation of naval hospitals \$1,871,000; vehicles (non-combat) \$1,335,000; maintenance and materials handling equipment \$1,000,000; and audio-visual laboratories \$4,000. This activity provides funds for material of a non-recurring nature required in outfitting new activities or expanding existing activities, vital to the mobilization program of the Medical Department. Provision is made for emergency stand-by supplies such as blood plasma, and blood substitutes, replacement of ambulances, trucks, materials handling and maintenance equipment. Under this program there are six specific non-recurring requirements

for which funds are requested herein, they are: (1) medical stores required in the amount of \$48,760,000 broken down as follows: \$41,297,000 to cover such items as cannot be obtained from industry within the time required after mobilization; \$842,000 to procure a newly developed compact, light-weight and waterproof field chest, designed to hold the medical supplies and equipment required for the support of Navy and Marine Corps amphibious operation; \$2,886,000 to equip and supply certain vessels of the reserve fleet scheduled for activation at a future date necessary to place them in operating condition, the material to be on hand at the end of fiscal year 1952; \$1,067,000 to cover the cost of processing 213 units of out-dated blood plasma now owned by the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery for transfer to the Department of Defense stockpile; \$1,304,000 to replace depot stocks of medical material surveyed because of damage in transit and storage, breakage and deterioration; \$796,000 to build up ship and station stock levels of medical supplies in order to maintain the currently prescribed level of six months minimum stock per man; \$441,000 for ships and shore dispensaries for the new medical facilities to be provided for increased personnel strengths; and \$127,000 for initial outfitting equipment for the Naval Hospital at Bainbridge, Md. (2) \$6,830,000 for the financing of the Navy share of the Department of Defense blood substitutes and blood plasma stock-pile programs; (3) \$1,871,000 for the activation of additional beds at naval hospitals in order to provide bed spaces for increase patient loads; (4) \$1,335,000 for the replacement of ninety-seven metropolitan ambulances and 215 trucks which are over age and worn out and the procurement of eleven bus-type ambulances and 28 field ambulances; (5) \$1,000,000 for the replacement of over age and worn out materials handling equipment, and initial requirements at expanded facilities under the management control of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery; and (6) \$4,000 for the installation of audio-visual laboratories at the naval hospitals at Corpus Christi, Texas, and Oceanside, California.

The request for \$3,650,000 in Activity No. 7 for the "Medical Supply System" is to provide for personal services, maintenance and operation of the issuing depots of the Naval Medical Supply System located at Edgewater, New Jersey and Oakland, California, and the Naval Medical Material Office at Brooklyn, New York; packing and crating of supplies and equipment for shipment; repair and replacement of component parts of returned equipment for storage and reissue is indicated. The Medical Supply depots are so disbursed strategically as to meet the present and foreseeable future requirements for the storage and distribution of standard items of medical and dental material in common use throughout the Medical Department.

Funds in the amount of \$1,906,500 are requested in Activity No. 8 for "Medical Care in Non-Naval Facilities" broken down as follows: hospitalization \$1,813,920; treatments \$231,000; and contract items \$93,580, less \$232,000 in reimbursements. It is contemplated that during fiscal year 1952 civilian hospitals will provide 14,793 patient days at a cost of \$18.75 per day for a total of \$277,368; U. S. Public Health hospitals 3,472 patient days at a cost of \$12.25 per day for a total of \$42,532; United States Army hospitals 164,700 patient days at \$7.50 per day for a total of \$1,235,250; United States Air Force hospitals, 18,300 patient days at \$7.50 per day for a total of \$137,250;

and Veterans Administration hospitals 9,920 patient days at \$12.25 per day for a total of \$121,520. Treatments in civilian hospitals are estimated to cost \$223,900; at Public Health Service facilities \$3,000 and at Veterans Administration facilities \$4,100.

Activity No. 9, "Care of the Dead" estimates the amount of \$643,000 to provide all necessary care of remains of deceased Navy and Marine Corps personnel, consisting of embalming, local burial or preparation for shipment elsewhere for burial, clothing, caskets and funeral flags, as well as transportation and secondary funeral expenses. Deaths are anticipated on a mortality of two per thousand personnel. The funds requested provide for an estimated 1,986 deaths during fiscal year 1952 at an average cost per death of \$323.76.

The \$84,000 requested for "Industrial Mobilization and Procurement Planning," Activity 10, is to provide for the preparation of plans to obtain the medical needs of the military services, including the pre-determination of wartime sources of supply of medical materials and plans for effective utilization of production and distribution capacity in support of the military forces. The amount requested herein are for the Navy's one-third prorated share of the operating expenses of the Industrial Mobilization and Procurement Planning Division of the Armed Services Medical Procurement Agency. This agency is a joint project of the Army, Navy, and Air Force and the costs are divided equally between the three services.

The committee recommends a reduction in this appropriation request of \$775,000 to be applied against funds for the procurement of civilian personnel. It is the opinion of the committee that through careful management of personnel requirements the estimated requirements may be reduced by at least 250 man-years without reduction in efficiency.

Funds are requested in this appropriation for the replacement of 97 ambulances and it was indicated that procurement of the heavier type of ambulance was under consideration. It is the opinion of the committee that the lighter type of ambulance which is on procurement by the other services will be satisfactory and adequate for the purposes intended. Accordingly it is recommended that only the lighter type of ambulance be procured.

CIVIL ENGINEERING, NAVY

The function of the appropriation "Civil Engineering, Navy" is to support the technical and operational supervision and inspection of the Public Works, Public Utilities and Transportation and construction equipment of the entire Naval establishment; provide for the engineering functions necessary to carry out these responsibilities; support administrative and engineering organizations such as the Bureau of Yards and Docks and the District Public Works office; operate the Public Works centers at Norfolk and Guam, the central district Public Works shops, and the Public Works departments at many Naval stations; provide shore support to overseas operations; support the Seabees in their high speed construction overseas; provide for procuring, receiving, storing, maintaining, and shipping material and equipment to advance bases; maintain and operate advance base depots and construction battalion centers.

Of the \$203,488,000 requested in this appropriation, 42 percent is for major procurement items, mostly material and equipment for use in advance bases. Another 42 percent represents the amount required for the maintenance and operation of the Bureau of Yards and Docks management control activities, and civil engineering support for the Navy's shore establishment; 9 percent for automotive and construction equipment; 5 percent for maintenance and operation of defense housing units located throughout the Naval establishment; and 2 percent to meet responsibilities for research and development and for industrial mobilization.

During fiscal year 1951 a construction battalion center was operated at Port Hueneme, California. In fiscal year 1952 it is proposed to operate two additional construction battalion centers one at Gulfport, Mississippi, and the other at Davisville, Rhode Island. These are required for training facilities and to handle the volume of materials and equipment being procured. No increase in the present level of operation is contemplated at Port Hueneme although provision is made for continuing the level of operations at the present rate.

The total appropriation request for civil engineering, Navy, in the amount of \$203,488,000 is divided into nine activities, the first of which is research and development.

Subactivity 1, Research and Development, \$1,949,000 is requested for programs of a classified nature which have been approved by the Research and Development Board of the Navy. The purpose of such programs is to accelerate a research and development program for improvement of engineering materials and equipment. This program is coordinated with the other services to avoid duplication and to assure that only projects of the highest priority are undertaken.

Subactivity 2, Public Works Centers and Logistic Support, \$81,554,000 is requested for carrying out the programs in this subactivity. This subactivity is divided into eleven minor programs as follows: Program 1 is "Public Works Centers and District Public Works Shops" for which \$21,132,440 is requested. In certain districts, numerous contiguous Naval activities each formerly had separate Public Works shops and departments. The latter have been replaced either by Public Works centers or District Public Works shops to effect economy and eliminate duplication. The consolidation is expected to permit building trades shops, transportation, weight-handling facilities, power generation and distribution systems to be managed by a single administrative organization. At the beginning of fiscal year 1952, there will be in operation two Public Works centers, one located at Norfolk, Virginia; and the other at Guam, Marianas Islands. District Public Works shops will be in the twelfth, fourteenth and fifteenth Naval districts. The Construction Battalion Center, Port Hueneme, California, the administrative and service divisions of the Naval Advance Base Depots at Davisville, Rhode Island and Gulfport, Mississippi, act as Public Works Centers for all activities under the depots. Beginning with fiscal year 1952, this appropriation will finance all costs of maintaining and operating the Public Works Department of fourteen Naval stations; four of which are overseas and four that will serve the inactive Reserve fleet.

The Public Works Centers and the District Public Works shops provide maintenance and repair services for transportation and construction equipment and the maintenance, repair and operation of

Public Works and Public Utilities for other Naval activities in the area. These activities assume the cost of maintenance and repair of distribution, transportation, garbage and trash collection equipment, inter-connecting streets, roads, and utility systems serving two or more activities. Funds under this program absorb the overhead of the work or services furnished such as supervisory personnel, leave and holiday pay, etc. The funds also cover such items as maintenance and repair of shop buildings and grounds, collateral equipment and for the procurement or generation of power and other utilities utilized by the centers and shops.

Program 2, "Public Works Department at Naval Stations," for which \$17,809,000 is budgeted, provides for the Public Works departments at fourteen Naval stations under the management control of the Chief of Naval Operations. Four of these stations are located outside the continental limits of the United States. Four others were formerly under the fiscal control of the Bureau of Ships, and their mission is to furnish servicing and housing facilities for the Atlantic and Pacific inactive Reserve fleets. All other Naval stations serve the active fleets. Funds budgeted under this program are to provide for recurring maintenance and operating costs, rehabilitation and special emergency projects. Included under this program are such items as maintenance and repair of buildings, grounds, streets, roads, utility distribution systems, transportation pools, sewage and garbage disposal systems, and cost of travel of military and civilian personnel assigned to the Public Works Department.

Program 3, "Construction Battalion Center, Port Hueneme, California, administrative and service departments of advance base depots," for which \$16,939,000 is budgeted, is to carry out the program of administration of the advance base depots such as accounting and personnel records and furnishing public works organizations and equipment on the same basis as public works centers and District Public Works shops.

Program 4, "Maintenance, operation, and major repair projects for Ben Moreell Housing" for which \$1,013,000 is budgeted is for the maintenance, operation and major repairs of this project which is being converted to public quarters. At the present time the cost of utilities, garbage collection, and similar services at this project is borne by the tenants. As public quarters, the expenses must be assumed by the Navy for the 1,362 units. Since most of these units were constructed during the war period, inferior equipment, such as hot water boilers, gas ranges and refrigerators, were installed. This equipment has deteriorated and must be replaced before many units are acceptable for public quarters. In addition, there will be normal expenditures required for day to day maintenance and operation, such as painting, structural repairs and the servicing of heating systems, refrigerators, etc.

Program 5, "Procurement of warfare defense material and equipment," for which \$984,000 is budgeted, is to provide funds for the purchase of long-lead time items of warfare defense equipment. Funds are required at this time to put the items in production in quantities sufficient to provide training allowances for the training of forces during the fiscal year.

Program 6, "Rehabilitation of automotive and construction equipment," for which \$850,000 is budgeted, is to provide for the rehabilita-

tion and reassignment of equipment excess to the needs of the various districts or no longer serviceable. A survey is made of such equipment and where found practicable the equipment is shipped to a central repair shop for rehabilitation with the proviso that reassignment may be made without regard to management control bureaus.

Program 7, "Portable power plants," for which \$6,750,000 is requested, is a new program to provide a source of emergency power in the event of interruption of power to Naval installations, such as shipyards, air stations, operating bases, due to disaster caused by sabotage, hurricane or enemy action. It was represented to your committee that there is a real need for emergency power in the event of major breakdown to existing power plant equipment due to its age and condition. The power plants at some of the older installations such as the shipyard at Philadelphia, and the one at Boston, although still adequate for normal operations, may be subject to breakdowns causing major interruptions in service when called upon to carry greatly increased continuous loads in the event of mobilization.

Program 8, "Cataloguing," for which \$125,000 is budgeted for covers two responsibilities. First, individual bureaus and offices of the National Defense Department have been directed to support Munitions Board cataloguing programs in their appropriations for the first time in fiscal year 1952. Of the total request, \$75,000 represents the cost of the civil engineering responsibilities in connection with Munitions Board cataloguing programs and \$50,000 is included to continue the regular Navy cataloguing program. These amounts represent only the cost of necessary printing.

Program 9, "Procurement of prototypes," for which \$1,289,600 is budgeted, is for the procurement of prototypes which previously have been financed under the industrial mobilization program. The Munitions Board and the Bureau of the Budget have stated that the prototypes to be procured under this activity are not proper items to be included under industrial mobilization. The prototypes are needed for major procurement items in order to obtain the most economical and efficient equipment.

Program 10, "Other Logistic Support," for which a total of \$657,960 is budgeted as follows: \$216,400 for logistic support of the Yards and Docks Supply Office at Port Hueneme; increased procurement for construction battalions; increased operation of the Automotive Storehouses at Brandywine, Maryland and Cheatham Annex, Norfolk, Virginia; and funds for operation of the Commissary Store and CEC Officer's School, Port Hueneme. \$432,960 for logistic support for Homoja housing facilities at Port Hueneme and the housing unit for the post graduate school for Civil Engineer Officers at Troy, N. Y.; funds for the rental of motor vehicles for the Inspectors of Naval Materials when this is more economical than the full time assignment of vehicles; \$8,600 for contributions to the Naval Management and other funds to cover the Bureau's cost of printing, material procurement control and beneficial suggestion program.

Program 11, "Harbor Entrance Control Protection," estimates amount to \$14,014,000. This program provides for the procurement of certain equipment and materials for protection of various continental and overseas harbors. A complete shopping list of these materials was furnished for inspection.

Activity No. 3, Industrial Mobilization, for which \$455,000 is budgeted, is broken down into two subactivities. Reserve plant program, for which \$425,000 is requested, is to provide funds for the administration of the leases and inspection of all plants in the Naval Industrial Reserve Program; for the preparation of yard maps of these plants, and for the expenses of the officers in charge of construction at such of these plants which will receive major repairs, alterations and modernization. The bureau is presently administering thirty-five leases and permits, covering use and occupancy of Naval Industrial Reserve Plants. As the number grows through leasing additional plants, provided for by law, more personnel will be required for lease administration.

The subactivity, "Production Allocation Program," for which \$30,000 is requested, represents the contribution of the Bureau of Yards and Docks to the Office of Naval Material for the support of the Naval field inspectors. Inspectors make periodic visits to commercial industrial plants for the purpose of making allocations of production or determining availability of plant capacity for requirements in the event of mobilization.

Activity No. 4, "Departmental Administration," for which \$5,324,000 is requested is divided into six subactivities. The subactivity, "Salaries," for which \$4,378,000 is requested, covers salaries for 1,050 civilian personnel. These Bureau of Yards and Docks employees administer technical control over the maintenance, operation, and repair of public works and public utilities of the entire shore establishment, including plant facilities and extensions, financed with Navy funds. They furnish technical assistance and advice in connection with the training of construction battalions, and civil engineering offices; they design and procure the equipment necessary for construction battalion units; develop research and development programs in liaison with the Office of Naval Research in the Secretary's office; administer the purchase, lease and disposal of real estate for the entire Navy Department, and handle the custody of inactive real estate and facilities.

The subactivity, "Printing and Reproduction," for which \$197,000 is budgeted, covers the program for furnishing various forms, directives, and manuals which have been developed by the Bureau and are furnished as technical services to the shore establishment.

The subactivity, "Expendable supplies and materials", for which \$133,500 is budgeted, provides expendable supplies and materials required for all departmental employees.

The subactivity, "Furniture and Equipment", for which \$223,000 is budgeted, replaces the worn out wartime equipment and furniture, and outfits offices for more than 239 additional employees to be recruited during the year.

The subactivity, "Officer and civilian travel", for which \$269,500 is budgeted, provides for officer travel (temporary additional duty) and civilian travel of personnel on official duty to the field from the department. The accelerated program, particularly under Public Works, involving construction projects throughout the world, of approximately \$1,500,000,000 superimposed on the regular workload in furnishing technical services to all field activities, requires frequent trips to the field for the purpose of obtaining proper information and expediting the various programs.

The subactivity, "Other service support", for which \$123,000 is requested, provides such items as rental of time-saving office equipment, photographic equipment and supplies, postage, telephone costs, both long distance and local, and the microfilming of engineering plans.

Activity No. 5, "Construction Battalion Support," for which \$64,213,000 is requested, is divided into seven subactivities the first of which, "Advance Base Depots," budgets for \$14,000,000. Under this program are three advance base depots located at Port Hueneme, California; Davisville, Rhode Island; and Gulfport, Mississippi. The responsibility of these depots is to receive, store and ship advance base type materials and equipment, and to receive roll-up material from advance base areas which, upon receipt, is rehabilitated, catalogued and placed in storage for future use.

Subactivity 2, "Training Facilities at Advanced Base Depots." It has been found necessary to establish and operate training facilities for construction battalion personnel at the three advanced base depots for which \$583,000 is budgeted in this request. Training is also provided for approximately 250 authorized organized reserve units and 240 volunteer reserve units.

Subactivity 3, "Equipment Replacement for Construction Battalion Operating Units." No funds are requested for 1952 under this subactivity.

Subactivity 4, "Procurement of Classified Items." \$43,840,000 has been requested for this subactivity. In accordance with CNO directives, this program provides for materials and equipment for construction battalion unit fleet marine force and specified advanced base programs. A detailed shopping list for the equipment under this program has been shown to the Committee.

Subactivity 5, "Maintenance of Advanced Base Components." This subactivity provides \$3,300,000 for funds to maintain, test, repair and rehabilitate emergency stocks maintained on the East and West coasts. These emergency stocks have a plant value of approximately \$180 million and the annual requirements for the maintenance, testing, repair or rehabilitation is approximately 3 percent of the plant value. Testing of mobile equipment is for exercise purposes in order that internal combustion engines, bearings, and other movable parts of the equipment will be maintained in a usable condition.

Subactivity 6, "Construction Battalion Reserve Training Equipment." Funds in the amount of \$1,300,000 are requested in this activity in order to provide equipment for the training of approximately 250 authorized organized reserve units and 240 volunteer reserve units. This training is conducted in home town armories, as well as the four other naval activities. The units have been really handicapped up to the present in having neither sufficient nor the proper type of technical training equipment.

Subactivity 7, "Operating Support of Construction Battalions." For the logistic support of authorized construction battalion units, \$1,190,000 is budgeted to provide such items as tires, batteries, gasoline, special clothing, and consumable supplies. The battalions' strength has been nearly doubled to 10,607 officers and enlisted men. The average cost per man for operating support is \$250, or a total of \$2,651,750. This increase has been made since the preparation of the 1952 budget and reflects a shortage in this appropriation of \$1,461,750.

Activity No. 6, "District Public Works Offices," for which \$19,457,000 is requested is divided into five subactivities of which the "District Public Works Offices" is the first subactivity and the largest, budgeting for \$15,181,000. Funds in this program are for the support of sixteen District Public Works Offices located in the several Naval districts and in the Potomac and Severn River Naval commands. It is the responsibility of this bureau to furnish technical services to the Naval shore establishment. The functions and responsibilities of the Public Works Offices include the administration and supervision of periodic inspections of public works and public utilities of the entire shore establishment; the technical control of all public works organizations of the shore establishments; the supervision and inspection of all Naval shore construction financed from all Naval appropriations; the planning and design which can be accomplished by District Public Works personnel for all construction projects financed from other bureaus annual appropriations; the accomplishment of selection, acquisition, leasing and disposal of all real estate for the Navy; the technical control for the utilization and maintenance of automotive equipment for all shore activities; the investigation of sanitary conditions and water supply; the control of fire protection measures; and the provision of technical services, including topographic and hydrographic services and technical determination with respect to maintenance, repair and operations of all public works and public utilities.

Subactivity 2, "Base development section, Guam, Marianas," performs approximately the same activities as those of District Public Works Offices in the various Naval districts. For this purpose \$1,225,000 is budgeted.

Subactivity 3, "Bureau of Yards and Docks Directors, Overseas Division." \$500,000 is budgeted for this subactivity. These directors and their staffs represent the Chief of the Bureau in engineering matters, in all locations outside the continental limits of the United States. The Director of the Atlantic Division has cognizance over the activities in Newfoundland, Bermuda, the Caribbean area, the Canal Zone, and various offices in Europe and Africa; the Director of the Pacific and Alaskan Division has cognizance over naval installations in Alaska, the Hawaiian Islands, the Mariana Islands, the Philippine Islands, and other islands in the Pacific. For reason of the large increase in the recent workload, it has been necessary to increase the personnel of these offices.

Subactivity 4, "Engineering Planning." \$400,000 is requested for this subactivity which pays for the preparation of development plans for new floating drydocks, the reactivation of existing floating drydocks and the selection of sites for their location. In the event of mobilization, it will be necessary to reactivate many additional floating drydocks in order to meet the needs of the fleet for docking facilities at both continental and overseas advanced locations. Most of the presently available construction facilities will be required for the ship reactivation and construction programs. For this reason, plans must be made for the utilization of floating drydocks which are reactivated or constructed.

Subactivity 5, "Civil Works Advanced Planning" requires \$2,121,000 for the advanced planning for the payment of rehabilitation and expansion of naval and national industrial reserve plants. The

funds requested were estimated on a basis of 6/10's of 1 percent of the construction costs of these plants.

Activity No. 7, "Defense Housing", for which \$9,920,000 is requested is to cover needs at approximately eighty locations throughout the continental United States and overseas comprising approximately 25,000 housing units. These housing projects were constructed as temporary facilities of war time materials from eight to ten years ago and because of the usual wear and tear are urgently in need of structural repairs including re-roofing, replacement of wooden porches, steps, construction of fire escapes for two story wooden apartment buildings, replacement of worn-out equipment such as hot water heaters and tanks, cooking ranges, space heaters, kitchen sinks, and other necessary equipment. Approximately 90 percent of these housing units are of wood construction and require exterior painting as well as the replacement of war time equipment of inferior quality. All projects have been in use since about 1941 and subjected to an average tenant turnover of approximately 60 percent per year. Due to increased defense activities and for security reasons it is important that key operating personnel be housed as near as possible to station centers.

Activity No. 8, "Automotive and Construction Equipment Procurement" for which \$18,616,000 is requested, includes four subactivities:

Subactivity 1, "Passenger Carrying Vehicles (all Navy)," for which \$4,450,000 is requested to procure vehicles to meet the transportation needs resulting from increases in personnel in connection with the expansion of the naval establishment and for a minor portion of the replacement requirements based upon ground rules established by the Bureau of the Budget.

Subactivity 2, "Carry-alls (all Navy) and Trucks," for which \$4,392,000 is requested, provides for 1,624 trucks, trailers including general purpose, specials and carry-alls. The portion of the trucks are to be procured for the purpose of increasing the Bureaus' fleet. This is particularly necessary for the reactivation of the two advanced base depots at Davisville, Rhode Island and Gulfport, Mississippi. These depots will support the vast increase in procurement of material and equipment for advanced base purposes.

Subactivity 3, "Freight, Cost on Above," for which \$885,000 is requested to pay the shipment of vehicles, which is estimated to cost approximately 10 percent of the value of the vehicles.

Subactivity 4, "Construction, Railroad, Weight Handling and Utility Equipment and Freight Cost," for which \$8,889,000 is requested. Provides funds for the procurement of equipment for outfitting the advanced base depots as well as for the partial replacement of overage equipment. The equipment consists of such items as crawler cranes, truck mounted cranes, motor graters, electric welders, air compressors, and miscellaneous construction and material handling equipment. The freight cost is estimated to be about \$800,000.

Activity No. 9, "Engineering Research Facilities," for which \$2,000,000 is requested is divided into two subactivities as follows: Civil Engineering Research and Evaluation Laboratory, Port Hueneme, California, for which \$1,790,000 is budgeted; and the Artic Test Station, Point Barrow, Alaska, for which \$201,000 is budgeted.

The program at Port Hueneme, California, is to provide for the indirect service support of the research program of the Bureau of Yards and Docks at the Civil Engineering Research and Evaluation Laboratory at that point, and the evaluation of all types of engineering materials and equipment, together with the development and service test covering all phases of the bureau's technical engineering responsibilities.

The \$210,000 budgeted for the Arctic Test Station covers the only activity of this kind under the cognizance of the Bureau of Yards and Docks where cold weather tests of the various items of material, equipment, and structures, can be conducted.

The committee recommends a reduction of \$7,000,000 in this appropriation, of which \$2,000,000 is to be applied to a reduction of 600 man-years of civilian employment requested and the balance to other items due to lag in production and delivery time of items for the program.

RESEARCH, NAVY

The Navy's research and development program is a highly integrated, Navy wide effort that is designed to increase the general fund of scientific knowledge and to provide the technical evaluation necessary to insure that naval forces are equipped with the most advanced materials with which to carry out their assigned missions. It is planned, managed, and financed by the several bureaus, the Marine Corps, and the Office of Naval Research. It embraces basic research for the solutions of long-range technical and scientific problems, and applied research, which is aimed at providing specific scientific and technical knowledge for the solution of immediate problems as they arise. Included are research and development programs in the vitally important areas of electronics, counter measures, high temperature materials, synthetic fuels and lubricants, anti-submarine warfare, air defense, chemical warfare, and operational evaluation of weapons. Many of the solutions achieved since the beginning of the Korean War have already paid dividends through the development and production of improved weapons and better equipment.

The committee feels that the security and welfare of the nation depends today, as never before, upon the rapid expansion, progress, and exploitation of scientific knowledge, the examination and evaluation of such knowledge to locate every possible scientific potentiality for military application, and finally, intensive research in the area of such potentialities to obtain the quickest possible application to military weapons, equipment, training, and other operational problems. The fast, efficient, and effective expansion and application of these basic research programs into the area of applied research projects of immediate importance to military problems, constitute the most significant feature of the request for funds outlined herein. These funds will continue the program at a slightly higher level than during 1951. The program of basic research because of its demonstrated effectiveness and productivity should be maintained on a high level. The applied research program should be accelerated and expanded to the greatest extent possible within the funds request-

ed in an effort to translate scientific knowledge into better weapons, equipment, and techniques.

The committee was informed that the Navy research and development programs have been carefully screened by the Department of Defense Research and Development Board to insure that they are integrated with the programs of the other Services.

The total planned outlay for the Navy-wide research and development program is \$519,600,000, of which the amount of \$425,000,000 comprises direct costs, and the amount of \$94,600,000 comprises indirect costs. Of the total amount, \$69,698,000 is for the Appropriation "Research, Navy", to carry out the programs of the Office of Naval Research.

The overall request under the Appropriation "Research, Navy", in the amount of \$69,698,000, is divided into five activities as follows: (1) "Research and Development", \$50,918,000; (2) "Maintenance and Operation of Research Facilities", \$12,750,000; (3) "Departmental Administration", \$2,540,000; (4) "Installation and Maintenance of Special Devices", \$2,750,000; and (5) "Patents", \$740,000.

Activity No. 1, "Research and Development," for which \$50,918,000, is requested is divided into four sub-activities as follows: (1) contract research program \$33,668,000; (2) Naval Research Laboratory, \$9,000,000; (3) Special Devices Center, \$8,000,000; and (4) Underwater Sound Reference Laboratory, \$250,000. The contract research program of basic and applied research is conducted by contract with universities, commercial laboratories, and non-profit institutions. The program includes the continuing effort in the search for basic scientific knowledge which the Office of Naval Research has sponsored for the past five years, and a program of applied research aimed at providing specific scientific and technical knowledge necessary for the solution of immediate and anticipated naval problems. The twofold nature of this program, integrating as it does continued basic research with applied research in such fields as air defense, anti-submarine warfare, biological warfare, chemical warfare, intelligence operations, and human resources, insures the nation a constantly increasing superiority of weapons and equipment, and of training and competence of personnel. The utilization of widely dispersed civilian scientific resources located throughout the nation is a highly desirable method of conducting research since it eliminates, in time of emergency, delays and other difficult problems connected with breaking up established scientific teams and concentrating them in a few Government laboratories. Until the Korean incident the contract research program was primarily a program of basic research in all of the relevant fields of science, assuring a continuing effort on research problems. The Korean incident indicated the need for accelerated and expanded emphasis on both urgent areas of basic research and certain areas of applied research by the Office of Naval Research. The applied research and development programs of the material bureaus of the Navy required an immediate accent on the development and production of operational equipment and weapons. Existing research projects which were approaching the phase where specific technical application would be possible have been accelerated and expanded.

Subactivity 2 for which \$9,000,000 is budgeted is for the Naval Reserve Laboratory which exists primarily to increase the safety, reliability, and effectiveness of the Fleet. It provides the Navy with

the staff of scientific personnel fully competent in a number of fields of physical sciences and engineering development. The staff is engaged in the application of scientific and engineering advances to Naval operational needs. At the laboratory absolute security control can be maintained when a particular application of research requires such security. Basic research, applied research and development to meet the immediate and future requirements of the Navy, are conducted at the institution. Because of the urgencies created by the situation in Korea and the accompanying efforts to increase the strength of the nation's fighting forces, the laboratory is at present shifting its program emphasis towards applied research and development work. The present request for funds will continue this trend. Funds for this program are for the direct costs of research and development only, including only those costs which can be identified specifically with a given research project.

Subactivity 3, Special Devices Center, for which \$8,000,000 is budgeted, is directed toward the introduction of the human factor into the design and development of equipment, training devices, mass training techniques, and the evaluation of training devices and techniques. The program includes the development of flight, guided missile, undersea warfare, gunnery, atomic warfare; shipboard trainers utilizing operational equipment; studies on the recognition and identification of approaching air and submarine vehicles; methods for reducing momentum, torque, gravity, and motion disability; research in submarine habitability; application of television to mass training; submarine control; and instrumentation of all types of equipment. The objective of the research and development program of the Special Devices Center is the conservation of time, lives, and material through research leading to the actual development of new and improved training methods and equipment which can reduce the learning time involved, improve the quality of training, and permit safer, more rapid and more economical training in areas which could otherwise not be reached or afforded. Flight trainers which permit emergency operations too dangerous to practice in aircraft, target generators which present sonar, radar, fire control, and air defense problems to students where operational facilities are not available, and evaluators which can score and predict the usefulness of tactical plans are among the typical equipments which are planned to contribute to the operational readiness of military personnel. The conservation of the resources of time, personnel, and material which results from this program establishes it as an integral and essential part of the nation's defense effort.

Subactivity 4, Underwater Sound Reference Laboratory, for which \$250,000 is budgeted is to provide a facility for the accurate calibration and test of experimental and preproduction models of submarine acoustic equipment developed within and without the Navy; provides a facility for research and development toward the means and methods of making all types of highly accurate under water acoustic measurements desired by the Navy; and supplies standards of measurement to all naval activities and contractors engaged in sonar and allied work. Problems of undersea warfare are among the most critical facing the Navy at the present time. Defense tactics in submarine warfare require sound detection devices which are capable of detecting submarines operating at much higher speeds and over wider areas than

in the past. The increase in the request for funds from \$195,000 in 1951 to \$250,000 in the present budget is due to the rapidly increasing necessity for evaluation of service sonar devices and the need for the development of new, and the revision of old calibrated secondary standards, requested for use by Naval laboratories and contractors.

Activity No. 2—"Maintenance and Operation of Research Facilities," for which \$12,750,000 is requested, is divided into five subactivities, the first of which is Naval Research Laboratory for which \$8,410,000 is budgeted. The request for the laboratory includes the cost of general administration, supervision of the scientific divisions, procurement of plant equipment, maintenance of buildings and grounds, and various centralized services such as security, personnel, fiscal, and communications. The conduct of the fruitful research and development program depends to a considerable degree upon the efficient operation of the available facilities.

Subactivity 2, Special Devices Center, for which \$2,900,000 is budgeted, is to finance the maintenance and operation program of the Special Devices Center which includes the indirect costs of the contractual research and development program, and the total costs of general administration, staff services, plant maintenance and operation, and security. The increasing demand for training devices to train military personnel in the use of equipment has imposed a tremendous load on the Special Devices Center, the program having increased 132% in 1952 over 1950. The increase in funds for this program over the same period is 39%.

Subactivity 3, Underwater Sound Reference Laboratory, for which \$150,000 is budgeted, supports all indirect costs of the Underwater Sound Reference Laboratory such as general administration, staff services, maintenance and operation, plant equipment and security. Virtually all under water acoustic devices in use or in the late stages of development by the Navy, at one time or another, have been tested by the Underwater Sound Reference Laboratory. The acceptance of these devices depends in large part upon the measurements and calibrations made by the laboratory.

Subactivity 4, Branch Offices, for which \$1,190,000 is budgeted, provides for the continental branch offices which administer the Contract Research Program in the field. This program is widely dispersed and embraces more than a thousand individual projects divided among more than 250 contractors scattered throughout the United States, the territories, and the District of Columbia. The London branch office maintains liaison with the various scientific research organizations in Great Britain and the continent of Europe, in order to keep the Navy Department, including Chief of Naval Research, informed on important scientific developments.

Subactivity 5, Other Administrative Expenses, for which \$100,000 is budgeted is to provide funds for such items as the services of the area wage classification offices and the cost inspection service.

Activity No. 3—"Departmental Administration," for which \$2,540,000 is requested, provides funds for all costs of the departmental administration of the Office of Naval Research. Approximately two-thirds of the employment is composed of scientific and technical personnel engaged in administering the research and patent programs while only one-third includes those engaged in general administration, financial management, contract negotiation, and other supporting administrative functions.

Activity No. 4, "Installation and Maintenance of Special Devices", for which \$2,750,000 is requested, includes funds for the Special Devices Center and the Branch Offices. Under the Special Devices Center \$2,670,000 is requested to provide for the installation, maintenance, and servicing of training devices and such related tasks as assisting in the evaluation of the performance of new devices, establishing routine maintenance and overhaul procedures, evaluating maintenance difficulties and devising methods of overcoming them, and instructing Naval personnel in the utilization, operation, and maintenance of the devices. The program supports the specialized maintenance of devices at field training activities. The number of Naval personnel, civilian and military, qualified to install and maintain some of the more complex devices, such as the Link Instrument Trainers, Submarine Attack Teachers, and Operational Flight Trainers is not sufficient to insure the greatest possible use of these trainers; it is necessary, therefore, to secure contractual services of engineers especially skilled in the maintenance of such devices. The engineers also instruct personnel in the operation, installation, and maintenance of devices whenever practicable. This instruction is not of the formal type but rather on the order of in-service training and has proven to be a very effective method of training.

Special devices sections are located in three branch offices, namely, at Chicago, Pasadena, and San Francisco, and for the purposes of these three branch offices \$80,000 is budgeted.

Activity No. 5, "Patents," for which \$740,000 is required, is to provide for protection of the Department of the Navy in all matters pertaining to patents, royalties, licenses, copyrights, and related activities. This responsibility extends to management, supervision, administration, and control of all patent matters.

The primary objective of the Navy patent program under this responsibility is to minimize, or avoid entirely any payment by the Government for royalties, licenses, or other fees for the use of patented equipment, devices, or methods resulting from work financed by Navy funds. This objective is accomplished by various methods. One method is to assist Navy military and civilian personnel to obtain patents on new developments and inventions arising from their work by placing trained patent advisors in the field laboratories close to the source of patented material. Such patents give the Government, in general, and the Navy in particular, use of the new development or invention without the payment of a royalty or license fee. A second method used to save money is to investigate claims that are made against the Navy for the unlicensed use of patented inventions, disallowing by court action, invalid claims and negotiating a settlement of the claims that are found to be meritorious. Savings are also realized through investigation of royalty payments on procurement. When such payments are found to be excessive or unreasonable, a refund is obtained and future contract payments are reduced.

SERVICE-WIDE SUPPLY AND FINANCE, NAVY

This appropriation will provide funds necessary for the maintenance and operation of installations and facilities performing service-wide supply and finance functions, including supply depots and centers, clothing depots, market and purchasing offices, supply demand control

points, fleet fueling facilities, overseas air cargo terminals, regional accounting and disbursing offices, the material catalog office, the cost of inspection service, central freight control offices, and other service-wide supply and finance facilities. Maintenance and operation of the activities include such expenses as cyclic preservation of inventories, repairs and improvements to facilities, procurement of supplies and equipment essential to assigned missions, necessary warehousing, special clothing, printing and reproduction, research and development, cataloging and standardization, industrial mobilization, stevedoring, losses in exchange and the accounts of disbursing officers as authorized by law; and departmental administration. It also provides for all intra-Navy transportation costs except those costs that relate to Marine Corps troops and facilities and except those costs on procurement to first destination provided for under other appropriations.

The approved program objectives of the Navy for the budget year directly affect the operations financed under this estimate in two broad areas. First, the operational level of the Navy expressed in terms of military personnel, ships, and aircraft will be increased sharply. The flow of material through the supply distribution system in support of this operational level must be enlarged accordingly. Second, over and above the receipt of material for current operating use, the initiation of a major procurement program will result in the receipt of large quantities of reserve stock. This reserve material must be received, distributed as required, and stored.

The supply functions to be financed under this request cover, in general, the physical handling and storage of material, and the inventory control of Navy stockpiles. The workload can best be measured in terms of measurement tons of material physically handled and in terms of the number of lines on purchase and issue documents which must be processed through the inventory control system. With a knowledge of the volume of measurement tons expected to be received and issued during the budget year and the related document lines to be processed through the inventory control process, an estimate of the manpower requirements were made.

It is anticipated that the increased operating level and receipt of reserve stocks will increase the measurement tons of material which must be physically handled by approximately 77 percent in fiscal year 1952 as compared with fiscal year 1951. Likewise there will be a sharp increase in the workload volume of the inventory control system although it is represented this will not be in direct ratio to the increase in total tonnage handled. Requirements are predicated on factual analysis of current productivity and available resources.

One of the functions of the supply distribution system which is financed under this request is the intra-Navy movement of material by commercial transportation and by the Military Sea Transportation Service. Requirements for this purpose have been integrated with the plans of the inventory control system and represent the cost of transporting material within the system for use or storage. An additional transportation cost is included for the initial shipment of material under the cognizance of this Bureau on Government bill of lading from point of origin to first destination within the supply system. This cost is related directly to the procurement program.

In addition to the supply functions, the request provides funds for the operation of service-wide finance installations. Centralized stores

and financial accounting service is furnished all Bureaus, and centralized disbursing service for military and civilian payrolls and vendors' invoices is provided. The workload during the budget year has been projected after analysis of the effect of the expanding operating and procurement programs.

Certain important functions of this bureau are under the broad direction of other offices and agencies. The essential Cataloging Program receives direction from the Munitions Board as does the Industrial Mobilization Program while the Research and Development Program is reviewed by the Research and Development Board. The committee is advised that the funds included in this request for these purposes have been reviewed and approved by the applicable agencies.

The request for appropriation in the amount of \$497,602,000 for "Service-Wide Supply and Finance" is broken down into 8 major activities as follows: (1) Maintenance and Operation of Supply System—\$292,308,000; (2) Finance—\$20,835,000; (3) Material Control—\$26,646,000; (4) Transportation of Things—\$138,961,000; (5) Cataloging—\$10,403,000; (6) Research and Development—\$649,000; (7) Industrial Mobilization—\$1,000,000; and (8) Departmental Administration—\$6,800,000.

The budget activity "Maintenance and Operation of Supply System" for which \$292,308,000 is requested is divided into 17 sub-activities as follows: Control of stock, receipts and issues—\$42,994,600; Storage, inspection and inventory—\$74,221,400; Physical handling of material outside storage areas—\$42,422,400; Packing and crating of Navy material other than household effects—\$15,275,900; Packing and crating of household effects of military personnel—\$5,151,000; Initial and cyclic preservation—\$9,002,000; Procurement operations—\$7,285,900; Operation of fleet fueling facilities—\$7,938,900; Accounting and disbursing within Bureau of Supplies and Accounts managed activities—\$5,307,500; Security, including fire and police protection—\$6,561,200; Public works, maintenance of facilities and equipment—\$22,899,200; Printing and reproduction—\$5,036,000; Supply administration—\$22,858,000; Major essential repairs, improvements, alterations of plant facilities—\$6,410,000; Procurement of material for advanced base components \$1,280,000; Procurement of vehicles (non-combat)—\$1,619,000; and Procurement of railroad construction and heavy materials handling equipment—\$16,045,000.

This budget activity, "Maintenance and Operation of Supply System," provides funds for maintenance and operating expenses at supply centers and depots; at Navy purchasing offices, and market offices, and other supply establishments under the management control of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts and for the operating expenses of supply departments of Naval shipyards. These costs include all personal services, labor, consumable supplies, and contractual services required to procure, receive, inspect, store, record, issue, pack and crate for shipment the material and supplies required for the logistic support of shore, fleet, air and submarine operating Naval personnel. To prevent deterioration prior to use, this program includes costs for preservation including cyclic preservation of material in store. As part of the cost of operations, funds are included for the rental of real property; warehousing facilities, commercial utilities services and property-restoration charges assignable to operations upon termina-

tion of commercial leases; for renovating and cleaning special clothing; and for the direct labor and material involved in the operation of fueling facilities where issues of petroleum are made to the fleet. As a part of the cost of maintenance, funds are included for operation of power plants, heating plants, water systems, and sewage disposal plants; provision for guard services, fire fighting services and janitorial services; upkeep of grounds and streets; and maintenance and repair of public works, structures, construction equipment, transportation equipment, and materials handling equipment.

The program objectives indicate a required degree of readiness which is unparalleled during peacetime in that a sharp increase in operational level is evidenced for military personnel, ships, and aircraft, and that a large procurement program will result in an accelerated rate of matériel received and a requirement for storage space which will expand the resources of the system to the utmost. These two factors are of paramount importance in determining the needs of the program.

The estimates for procurement of railroad, construction and materials handling equipment are based on analyses of field activities' requirements for replacement of over age and worn equipment now in use and for additional equipment required for expanded operations.

The subactivity "Control of stocks, receipts, and issues" includes the functions of receipt control, issue control, technical research, stock controls, and disposal control and machine records. The work load of the program is measured in terms of line items processed on receipt and issue documents. Work measurement data indicates that 24.8 million line items will be processed during 1951 and that the estimated workload for 1952 will be 40.1 million line items; an increase of 62 percent. To handle the increased work load, an increase of man years employment of 56 percent is requested.

The subactivity, "Storage, inspection, and inventory," includes the functions of storage (handling of material in storage areas), inspection and physical inventory of material. The work load of the program is measured in terms of measurement tons of materials handled in and out of the supply system. Information presented to the committee indicated that 6,000,000 measurement tons will be handled during fiscal year 1951 and that the anticipated work load for 1952 will be increased to 10.6 million measurement tons, an increase of 77 percent, for which an increase in man years of 70 percent is requested.

For the subactivity, "Physical handling of material outside storage areas," the work load is measured in terms of measurement tons of material handled. The 1952 estimate of incoming material is 6.6 million measurement tons which is composed of four-million measurement tons to meet 1952 operation requirements and 2.6 million tons resulting from the reserve procurement program. The 1952 estimate of outgoing material is 4,000,000 measurement tons which is predicated upon a 33½ percent increase in operation over 1951. The percentage increase in work load for 1952, therefore, is 120 percent and 33 percent for incoming and outgoing tonnage respectively. The comparable man-year increases of 108 percent and 30 percent give effect to the efficiency projection.

The subactivity, "Packing and crating of Navy material other than household effects," indicates that during 1951 6.6 million units were packed. It is estimated that the work load will be 25 percent greater

during 1952 for which an increase of 22 percent in man years employment is requested.

The estimate for the subactivity, "Packing and crating of household effects of military personnel," is based upon a projected 33½ percent increase in work load resulting from Navy expansion and for this purpose an increase of 30 percent in man years employment is requested.

The above are samples of the work load under maintenance and operation of the supply system and the man years increases required to handle the increased work load.

The subactivities, "Procurement of vehicles," and "Railroad, construction and heavy materials handling equipment," develop from inventory and usage reports submitted by field activities. They include the requirements for replacement of absolute items as determined by the table of life expectancy promulgated by the Chairman, Management Committee, Secretary of Defense, and include additional items required to handle the anticipated work load to be generated by the expanded procurement program under which a request for \$16,437,000 is made. With these funds, it is proposed to procure 406 trucks at a cost of \$1,619,000; 576 items of construction and heavy-weight handling equipment at a cost of \$6,374,000; 2,232 items of materials handling equipment at a cost of \$6,820,000; and 187 items of railroad equipment at a cost of \$1,624,000.

The committee was advised that electrically operated materials handling equipment is procured without batteries and to provide new and replacement batteries for this equipment \$1,227,000 will be required. This will provide 876 batteries at an average cost of \$1,400 per battery.

Funds requested under the budget activity "Finance," in the amount of \$20,835,000, are to provide for the operation of offices performing service-wide accounting and disbursing services. The sub-activities under this request are: Cost Inspection Service—\$4,054,000; Field Branch, Cleveland, Ohio—\$5,935,500; Navy Accounts Disbursing Offices \$2,827,900; and Navy Regional Accounts Office and Small Craft Accounting Office—\$8,017,600. The scope of work performed by the Cost Inspection Service is Navy-wide but is not limited to Navy contracts. Under an expanded coordinated audit program the Cost Inspection Service has cognizance over a large number of Army and Air Force contracts at locations of common cost type contractors where the Navy has a predominant interest. The most important function performed by the Cost Inspection Service is the determination of the accounting accuracy of contractors' costs representation where such costs are the basis for contract price negotiations for reimbursement. Dependence on the cost inspection offices for this service permits the Navy to accelerate the defense effort and in addition results in substantial savings to the government. It is proposed to expand the highly trained professional staff of the cost inspection service to afford cost surveillance of the expanded Navy procurement program and to establish offices at contractors' plants where the size of cost-type production contracts merits the establishment of such offices. The level of operations of a cost inspection service is directly affected by the total procurement program and by the extent to which contractors' cost representations are the basis for contract price negotiation or reimbursement.

The functions of the Field Branch, Cleveland, Ohio, include the paying of allotments, mustering out pay, retired and retainer fee and death and uniform gratuities for the entire Navy. It also issues savings bonds purchased by allotments of naval personnel; performs administrative examinations and accounting analyses of closed pay records for all naval personnel semiannually and for closed pay records upon discharge; adjudicates arrears of pay claims of naval personnel; and settles General Accounting Office exceptions to accounts of Navy disbursing officers. Included in the estimate is an amount of \$15,000 for the purpose of reimbursing the general account of advances for losses in the accounts of Navy disbursing officers arising from exchange of foreign currency and acceptance of counterfeit currency and for such other causes as may be approved for relief pursuant to law. It is anticipated that military personnel strength of the Navy for 1952 will be 40 percent greater than for 1951, which will increase the work load of this activity.

Funds for the Navy Accounts Disbursing Offices for which \$2,827,900 is requested is to finance the operation of 15 Navy Accounts Disbursing Offices, which provide centralized disbursing services for military personnel within assigned areas. Services include the maintenance of pay accounts and the payment of pay and allowances, and the preparation and payment of travel claims. Military personnel served include personnel of the regular Navy and Naval Reserve on extended active duty, Naval Reserve personnel on training duty and Organized Reserve personnel entitled to drill pay. The workload is dependent upon the active duty military strength of the Navy, the strength of the Organized Reserve entitled to drill pay and upon the rate of turnover of military personnel served by the Navy Accounts Disbursing Offices.

The request of \$8,017,600 for the Navy Regional Accounts Offices and Small Craft Accounting Offices are for the operation of 13 Navy Regional Accounts Offices and two small craft accounting offices, which provide centralized and Navy-wide disbursing for material and services and regional examination and consolidation of accounting and financial data. The workload for the functions performed at Navy Regional Accounts offices and Small Craft Accounting Offices is dependent upon the military strength of the Navy, the number and level of operations of shore installations and ships, and the extent of the total Navy procurement program.

The request for funds in the amount of \$26,646,000 under the budget activity, "Material Control," is to provide funds for the personal services, the material necessary for the operation of all functions except cataloging at the eight supply demand control points located at the Aviation Supply Office, Philadelphia; Clothing Supply Office, Brooklyn; Electronic Supply Office, Great Lakes; General Stores Supply Office, Philadelphia; Ordnance Stock Office, Washington, D. C.; Ships Parts Control Center, Mechanicsburg, Pennsylvania; Submarine Supply Office, Philadelphia; Yards and Docks Supply Office and Port Hueneme, California. The Bureau of Supplies and Accounts coordinates the operations of the eight offices and recommends the best in procedures and methods to provide guidance for their operation and development. Each of the control points performs the following functions for an effective material control program: (1) Identification and determination of interchangeability of

parts; (2) Receipt, compilation, and analysis of periodic inventory reports; (3) Maintenance of records of material on order and due under contract; (4) Collection, analysis, and application of material usage data; (5) Translation of Navy operational, overhaul and maintenance programs into terms of material; (6) Determination of pipe-line requirements; (7) Periodic determination of excesses and deficiencies, together with initiation of action to dispose, redistribute, or procure this material. By fulfillment of this program, it is expected that the maximum supply support effectiveness will be obtained with the maximum economy in material purchase and inventory. In a period of military expansion and mobilization readiness, such a program becomes vitally important to insure that required material is on order or is stored at a place in the supply system where it is needed.

The comparative work load and man year requirements for the fiscal years 1951 and 1952 are as follows:

The function "Stock Control" will reflect a 15 percent increase in work load over 1951 and a 12 percent increase in man year requirements.

The function "Procurement Operations" will reflect a 20 percent increase in work load over 1951 and 18 percent increase in man year requirements.

The function "Technical Research and Classification" will reflect a 15 percent increase in work load over 1951 and a 12 percent increase in man year requirements.

The request for funds for the activity, "Transportation of Things," in the amount of \$138,961,000 may be divided for convenience of consideration into two items. The first is \$87,454,000 for inland transportation and second \$51,507,000 for ocean transportation.

The program for inland transportation provides funds to cover commercial transportation charges for the entire Naval Establishment, excluding transportation costs to first destination resulting from procurement of new materials by procuring appropriations under the cognizance of other bureaus and excluding all transportation costs incurred by the Marine Corps. The transportation charges incurred in the movement of Naval material include demurrage, refrigeration, recooling, and other similar services rendered by common carriers. In addition this program provides funds to cover parcel post shipments, contractual services for transportation of mail, contractual barging, drayage, and such other transportation costs. It is anticipated that inland transportation will increase from 3,817,233 tons in fiscal year 1951 to 5,095,646 tons in fiscal year 1952.

The program for ocean transportation provides funds to cover the movement of all Naval dry cargo (except Marine Corps requirements) and the movement of all Navy bulk petroleum (including Marine Corps requirements). The estimate includes ocean transportation requirements to be shipped on commercial carriers or by ships operated by Military Sea Transportation Service but exclude all movements by ships to the active fleet. It is estimated that 1,600,000 measurement tons of dry cargo will be moved during fiscal year 1952 and that 6,750,000 long tons of petroleum will be moved during the same period.

"Cataloging", the activity for which \$10,403,000 is requested is divided into two subactivities: first, "Navy Cataloging" in the amount of \$4,654,000; and second "Munition Board Cataloging" for which \$5,749,000 is requested. The program for Navy cataloging

provides funds for personal services, contractual services, and other costs for the Navy cataloging program at the Navy Catalog Office, New York, as well as the cataloging functions performed at five of the supply demand control points.

These offices develop and compare descriptions, eliminate duplicates, classify and number each description for all items of supply, and publish the information in the Catalog of Navy Material and such other cataloging media as required for supply management operations. Extensive identification, inter-changeability and end use application data are established in card files which are used in screening new items and in developing material requirements. The data for these various cataloging documents are compiled by the supply demand control point concerned, with the Navy Material Catalog Office performing much of the service centrally on the layout art work. These documents not only contain description and application data, but also necessary supply information such as requisitioning instructions, prices, and units of issue.

The Munitions Board cataloging program is directed toward achieving a unified cataloging system by developing standard item names, standard item descriptions, and a common numbering and commodity classification system. The bulk of this program is performed by cataloging personnel as a separate operation from the normal cataloging operations. Once the uniform data developed by the Munitions Board cataloging program are adopted by all services, they will be merged into the normal cataloging operations of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts.

The Research and Development activity, for which \$649,000 is requested, will enable the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts to perform a theoretical analysis, design development, and experimental evaluation of materials, methods, and techniques of work performed under the cognizance of the bureau, including regular and special clothing, subsistence, materials handling, packaging and preservation, and ship's store equipment, and comprises the bureau's portion of the integrated research and development programs of the Navy and the Department of Defense. This program is conducted under the directives from the Chief of Naval Operations pursuant to recommendations of the Navy Research and Development Review Board, and is reviewed for essentiality to the over-all research and development program of the Department of Defense by the Research and Development Board.

The activity "Industrial Mobilization" for which \$1,000,000 is requested provides funds for two sub-activities: (1) Machine Tools and Production Equipment—\$365,000; and (2) Planning within the Department of Defense—\$635,000. The "Machine Tools and Production Equipment" program provides funds for the preservation, handling, and storage of industrial reserve machine tools, manufacturing aids and other items of production equipment, including special equipment, such as gauges and items of laboratory equipment at Bureau of Supplies and Accounts activities. To provide the preservation and proper storage of industrial reserve machine tools, fifteen buildings have been dehumidified. By controlling the humidity under 40 percent within these buildings, the normal preservation cycle is extended indefinitely. The costs of operation and mainte-

nance of dehumidification machinery, and maintenance of the buildings are approximately \$7,000 per year for each building.

The program "Planning within the Department of Defense" provides for the determination of wartime requirements and the preparation of production schedules for industry covering items assigned to the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts for single service procurement, and for other general stores items.

The request for funds in the amount of \$6,800,000 for the activity, "Departmental Administration," is broken down into four sub-activities as follows: (1) Bureau administration (executive direction and other common services) \$2,787,200; (2) Administration of field supply activities \$1,751,000; (3) Administration of material control \$547,200; and (4) Administration of field accounting and disbursing activities \$1,714,600. Under the program "Bureau administration" falls the responsibility for logistic research and planning; the assignment of Supply Corps officers and recommendations for their training programs; the planning, organization and administration of a comprehensive civilian personnel program for departmental and field personnel of the Bureau; the furnishing of legal advice and of recommendations and information on proposed legislation; the preparation of the bureau's appropriation budget and the maintenance of appropriation accounting records; the control of field allotments and maintenance of returns in connection therewith; the inspection of field activities under the Bureau's cognizance; the administration of the management control program; the administration of the printing, publication, and forms program for the Bureau; and the furnishing of office service for the Bureau. The functions to be accomplished under this program (of the bureau administration) are related to the level of operation of the Navy and Bureau employment.

The program, "Administration of field supply activities," provides for the administration of Navy-wide technical control of storage space; control of supply operations for material within the Navy supply system; Navy-wide control of commercial transportation of Navy freight by land, sea, and air; Navy-wide control of messing operations and liaison with the Office of the Quartermaster General on subsistence matters; Navy-wide control of fuel; policy control of Navy purchasing offices; control of Navy transportation offices; technical control of clothing functions; and the establishment and maintenance of uniform policies for ships' service stores, ships' stores, and commissary stores together with the procurement program for these activities.

The program, "Administration of material control," includes the responsibility for business management of the Navy supply system in its day-to-day function of providing, when and where required, any, or all of approximately two and one-half million items of Navy material and parts; planning and development for more efficient operation of the system; and coordination of application by the system of procedures necessary to assure the maximum economy in purchase of material and in inventories maintained which is consistent with effectiveness of supply.

The program, "Administration of field accounting and disbursing activities," provides for the operation of the system of accounting for Navy property and material, for appropriated funds, and for the cost of maintenance and operation.

The committee recommends a reduction of \$12,500,000 of which \$2,500,000 is to be applied against the request for employment of 700 man-years of civilian employees and the remaining \$10,000,000 against other activities under this appropriation. The committee feels that by more efficient management in the use of civilian employees and programming of the many activities under this appropriation no harm will be done to the over-all program by effecting the economies suggested.

NAVY STOCK FUND

The Navy Stock Fund is a revolving fund that provides for financing the purchase of a pool of common supply items required for the support and operation of the Navy and naval establishment and thereby eliminates the need for each of the many naval appropriations to maintain separate stocks of identical materials. In general terms, the fund finances the purchase of all stocks of general stores; automotive, materials handling, and construction equipment spare parts; special clothing; ships store and commissary store stocks; subsistence; fuels, lubricants and petroleum drums; and clothing and small stores. The stocks so procured are distributed through a system of depots and stock points to consumer activities such as ships, air stations, ship yards, ordnance plants, etc. Upon the issue of the stocks for use, the naval appropriation financing the work or operation consuming the stocks is charged, the fund reimbursed, and from such reimbursements the fund finances the replenishment of the stocks issued.

As of March 31, 1951, there was an inventory of stock on hand of \$1,081,090,000. The present request for \$475,000,000 is to augment the supplies and stocks now carried for the purposes of this Stock Fund to supply the increased personnel and activities of the Navy.

The committee recommends a reduction in this appropriation request of \$25,000,000 with the thought that a smaller purchase of civilian type items will result in certain savings and in economy of operation.

SERVICE-WIDE OPERATIONS, NAVY

The general purposes of the appropriation "Service-wide operations, Navy" are to finance Naval District Headquarters, the Potomac River Naval Command, and miscellaneous offices; service-wide expenses which are not readily allocable to activities serviced, and including administration and certain operating costs of Naval bases, Naval Operating Bases, Naval Stations and Port Directors; Navy's portion of certain joint international projects; Navy's communication system and associated elements; Hydrographic Office; Naval Observatory; Inter-American Cooperation; salaries and administrative expenses of the Office of the Secretary of the Navy, Chief of Naval Operations, and Judge Advocate General; Naval Records Centers and Records Management Offices; travel expenses of Members of Congress for inspection of Naval activities, and the promotion of goodwill programs at home and abroad, and extraordinary military expenses.

The appropriation request for service-wide operations in the amount of \$152,729,000 is divided into ten activities which will be discussed separately.

Activity No. 1, "Naval District and River Command Headquarters and Miscellaneous Offices," for which \$12,729,000 is requested is to

provide support for the Naval District and Potomac River Naval Command Headquarters, area wage and classification offices and the field offices of the Board of Inspection and Survey. It is contemplated that the Naval District and Potomac River Naval Command Headquarters will continue regular maintenance and operations in fiscal year 1952 at approximately the same level as that attained at the end of fiscal year 1951. Rehabilitation and special projects of a non-recurring nature will be curtailed to a considerable degree at those Naval activities during fiscal year 1952. Other significant items in the 1952 estimate are the increase in the staffs of area Wage and Classification Offices to meet the increased workload of those offices, decreases in the procurement of major equipment and the elimination of support of the Naval units of the trust territories due to the transfer of responsibility for the trust territories from the Navy to the Department of the Interior.

The fifteen Naval District and River Command Headquarters supported under this activity are responsible for coordination and provision of logistical and operational support to the operating forces; maintenance of industrial and personnel mobilization plans; coordination of communications, medical, dental, public works, legal, public relations, and Civil Service matters; preparation of plans for defense of Districts and Commands; and, other functions necessary to assure complete coordination within the Naval and Defense Establishments. The funds are to provide for recurring maintenance and operating costs such as civilian salaries, travel of military and civilian personnel; local communication costs; rents and utilities; supplies, materials and equipment; custodial service; printing and binding; transportation pools; housing; and similar items. The amount requested reflects a slightly increased level of Naval operations for fiscal year 1952 and reflects a full year's requirement for the build up that occurred during fiscal year 1951. Funds are included also to continue the program of rehabilitating shore establishment facilities to an effective operating condition.

Activity No. 2, "Naval Bases, Naval Operating Bases, Naval Stations and Port Directors," for which \$20,739,000 is requested is for the support of these Naval activities for a continuation of regular maintenance and operating functions at approximately the same level attained at the end of fiscal year 1951 and includes the full year's support of the build-up that occurred in 1951. Funds are included in the request to continue the rehabilitation of shore establishment facilities at a rate considerably less than during fiscal year 1951. Amounts requested for the procurement of major equipment will provide for a replacement of over age and wornout items only. Funds are not included for expanded equipment requirements or for stockpiling. The 12 Naval Base Headquarters supported under this activity are Shore Commands in specified geographical areas whose functions are to exercise military command and coordination control of associated and dependent Naval activities within the areas. Two of the 12 bases, namely Naval Base, Newport, Rhode Island, and Naval Base, Pearl Harbor, Territory of Hawaii, also provide direct operational and logistic support to units of the Fleet and to other shore activities in the area. Funds requested in this activity for the maintenance and operation of the Naval Base Headquarters, include such items as civilian salaries; travel of military and civilian personnel;

local communication costs; rents and utilities; consumable supplies and equipment; and similar costs. The request for the Naval Bases at Newport and Pearl Harbor include funds for such items as maintenance and repair of buildings; grounds; streets and walks; utilities systems; waterfront structures; housing; and other operating costs. The Naval Base at Los Angeles was established during fiscal year 1951 and financed for approximately one-third of that year. Funds are included in the present request for a full year's support of that Naval Base during 1952. Under this activity also are the funds for the financial support of Naval Operating Base Headquarters, Marianas Islands, and Guantanamo Bay, Cuba. The program also provides financial support for the Port Directors located at Norfolk, San Diego, and Long Beach. It likewise provides for the procurement of electronic and communication equipment for local communication purposes at Naval Stations, Naval Bases, Naval Operating Bases, and Port Director Offices. Also, the program provides for the procurement of non-passenger carrying vehicles, construction, railroad, fire-fighting, and weight and material handling equipment for use at Naval Bases, Stations, Naval Operating Bases, and Port Director's Offices.

Activity No. 3, "Joint International Projects," for which \$308,000 is requested is to support the Navy's part of the service-wide functions which are integrated into the international defense planning program. The objective of the several planning groups is to provide the Military Committee of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization with necessary information for a common defense plan of the Allied Powers in the North Atlantic Area. The increase of \$56,000 is based upon the attainment of a full complement of military and civilian personnel for the "Planning, North Atlantic Treaty" (PLANAT) which is a component of the Joint American Military Advisory Group, a unified staff command in London, England, established for the purpose of providing administrative services jointly to the North Atlantic Treaty organization and the European Coordinating Committee in the implementation of the North Atlantic Treaty. These groups are part of a joint command organization composed of Army, Navy, and Air Force sections which, through the Director of the Joint American Military Advisory Group, provide the Joint Chiefs of Staff representatives in Europe and other organizations military information related to intelligence, operational plans, logistic plans, force and equipment requirements, priorities, resources, deficiency lists, organization mobilization, training policy, security, and standardization. Funds made available for this program will provide for the support of administrative expenses such as civilian salaries; per diem; station allowances of both civilian and military personnel; the purchase, lease, alteration, repair, maintenance and operation of facilities, installations and equipment; the procurement of personal or other services; expenses of military and civilian personnel; the procurement of supplies and equipment; printing and binding; communication services; and, if authorized, transportation of dependents and personal property.

Activity No. 4, "Service-wide Communications," for which \$45,989,000 is requested is to provide for the operation and maintenance of the Naval Communication System at the augmented level planned for attainment by the end of fiscal year 1951, and for planned additional

facilities of the system and maintenance and operation of communication departments at certain Naval Stations under the management control of the Chief of Naval Operations. It provides also for the procurement of long lead-time items of electronic and communication equipments to provide an M plus 3 months mobilization equipment reserve for the Naval Communication System. The request is divided into four subactivities namely, Naval Communication System—\$14,520,000; Leased and Commercial Communication Facilities and Services—\$2,220,000; Support of other Naval Activities and Joint Agencies—\$3,221,000; and Procurement of Major Equipments—\$26,028,000.

Subactivity 1, for which \$14,520,000 is requested, is to provide the maintenance and operation of the Naval Communication System which is the basic communication network which provides the means of transmitting rapidly and securely orders and information to and from Naval forces and activities throughout the world whether afloat, ashore, or in the air. The program has been designed to meet the increased operational demands of the augmented fleet, the anti-submarine warfare program and communication support of Navy commitments, support of the vital communication security and supplementary activities, as well as the ancillary services of Fleet Post Offices, distribution of registered publications and administration of the Naval Communication System.

Subactivity 2, for which \$2,220,000 is budgeted, is to provide for leased and commercial communication facilities and services required for service-wide use in the Navy and Marine Corps, including leased telephone lines, commercial and teletypewriter exchange system service; commercial telegrams, cablegrams, and radiograms; leased weather and flight control services; and extra local and long distance toll charges for Service Wide Communication activities.

Subactivity 3, for which \$3,221,000 is budgeted, provides for certain maintenance and operating support of other Naval activities associated with the Naval Communication System, as well as certain joint agencies or projects prescribed by higher authority. The program will include the support of the Armed Forces Security Agency at the Navy Security Station, Washington, D. C.; the Navy's share in support of the Joint Communication Center; and provision for maintaining and operating communication departments in support of local communications at certain Naval Stations under the direct management of the Chief of Naval Operations.

Subactivity 4, for which \$26,028,000 is budgeted, provides for procurement of communications and electronic equipment for the Naval Communications System. In addition, it provides for a limited number of non-passenger carrying vehicles for use in maintaining Naval Communications Stations. These equipments are programmed to support necessary expansion and modernization, replacement of overage equipment, and a minimum communication mobilization reserve of high priority, long lead time electronic items. Of the amount requested under this subactivity, \$17,679,600 is included for the procurement of the communications M plus 3 months mobilization reserve of high priority items for the system. These items, all of a long lead time nature, comprise electronic equipments to enable the system to comply with M day requirements for communications as prescribed in basic mobilization plans.

Activity No. 5, "Hydrographic Office," for which \$14,781,000 is requested provides for a buildup in the productive capacity of the Hydrographic Office over that of the fiscal year 1951 augmented by contracting with other Government and non-Government charting agencies. It is represented as being necessary to build up the stock levels of nautical and aeronautical charts and publications to meet initial stages of mobilization by the end of fiscal year 1952, and to support the increased operating forces of the Navy. The request includes funds for increasing stock levels of critical long lead material items such as chart paper, plastics and zinc plates. Increases are provided for the Joint Navy-Air Force charting program and the Underseas Warfare Program to meet increased production rates for these programs, which have been directed by higher authority. The request is divided into three subactivities: (1) Special Navy U. S. Air Force Program—\$3,331,000; (2) Undersea Warfare Program—\$1,264,000; and (3) Nautical and Aeronautical Program—\$10,186,000. These programs for nautical and aeronautical items provide for the compilation, construction, reproduction, distribution, including maintenance in an up-to-date condition, of all charts and related publications, including navigational tables which are required by the Armed Forces as well as the U. S. Merchant Marine for the safety of navigation. It also provides for special intelligence studies and the preparation of special purpose charts for planning purposes.

Activity No. 6, "Naval Observatory," for which \$670,000 is requested to furnish the nation's naval, air and maritime services with astronomical data required for their safe navigation, to determine accurate time, and to transmit time controlled signals for the entire nation. In addition, the Naval Observatory conducts continuous astronomical observations, research and publishes and distributes the results thereof. The work of the Naval Observatory is of a continuing nature and no significant changes in purpose or magnitude are anticipated during fiscal year 1952. The activity is divided into five subactivities as follows: (1) Preparation and Publication of the Ephemeris and Nautical and Air Almanacs—\$232,000; (2) Determination and Transmission of Time—\$66,000; (3) Observation, Reduction, and Publication of Astronomical Data—\$119,000; (4) Maintenance and Operation of Buildings, Grounds and Facilities—\$202,000; and (5) Security—\$51,000.

Activity No. 7, "Inter-American Affairs," for which \$344,000 is requested to support the objectives of the Latin-American Affairs program to create and cement goodwill between the United States and the Latin-American Republics, and to promote the standardization of equipment, training and operation of the Navies in accordance with United States Navy standards. Aside from a slight increase in the level of the training film program, no significant deviation from the present level of operation is contemplated for this budget activity. The request is broken down into three subactivities namely; (1) Establishment, Maintenance and Operation for which \$206,000 is budgeted; (2) Tours, Visits and Official Representation—\$59,000; and (3) Training Films and Expenses—\$79,000.

Activity No. 8, "Departmental Administration," for which \$13,127,000 is requested is broken down into three subactivities. Subactivity (1), "Office of the Chief of Naval Operations", for which \$3,561,000 is budgeted is to support the Office of the Chief of Naval

Operations. The Chief of Naval Operations has the primary responsibility for command of the operating forces and responsibility for their readiness for war. This responsibility includes determination of the personnel and material requirements of the operating forces, including the order in which ships, aircraft, surface craft, weapons and facilities are to be constructed, maintained, altered and overhauled. This office coordinates and directs the efforts of the bureaus and offices of the Navy Department to effectuate availability of personnel and material where and when they are needed. The funds requested are to provide for the entire operational cost of the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations. These funds are sufficient to continue, through fiscal year 1952, the level existing at the end of fiscal year 1951 with a small increase in personnel to meet additional work load requirements. There is also provided a significant item for the reprinting of United States fleet manuals in conformance with the "Allied Naval Maneuvering Instructions". It is estimated that to enable this office to carry out the duties and responsibilities outlined above will require a total of 589 man years of civilian technical, administrative, stenographic and clerical employment in the fiscal year 1952 at an estimated cost of \$2,174,000. Printing and reproduction requirements will cost a total of \$660,000 of which approximately \$410,000 is needed to reprint a large number of tactical, operational and doctrinal publications in order that they will be in conformity with the above mentioned "Allied Naval Maneuvering Manual". Support for other objects such as civilian travel, local and long distance telephone service, office supplies, material and equipment, moving of and alteration to offices, rental of tabulating machines, and social security assessments will cost a total of \$727,000.

Subactivity 2, "Office of Judge Advocate General," for which \$690,000 is budgeted is to support the legal office of the Navy. The functions of the office include the administration of Naval justice, the settlement of claims for and against the Navy, the resolution of legal problems in the fields of taxation, international and general law, legal assistance to Naval and Marine personnel, resolution of administrative law problems relative to the military as well as to the civil aspects of the Navy, Congressional liaison, the development of legislation and reporting to Congress on matters of legislative interest. It is reported that the work loads of this office have increased during the past six months resulting from the expansion of the Armed Forces but that the work load will be continued and performed with no sizable increase in the civilian staff. However, due to recent congressional enactment of the "Uniform Code of Military Justice" some additional funds are requested which accounts for the major portion of the requested increase of \$89,000 over the requirements for fiscal year 1951.

Subactivity 3, "Executive Office of the Secretary," for which \$8,876,000 is budgeted, provides for the functions performed by this office including the development of policies and procedures relating to the procurement, production and utilization of materials and facilities; the Navy's civilian personnel program; financial administration; the Navy's information program; the administration and control of the Naval Petroleum and Oil Shale Reserves; the provision of legal services in the field of commercial law; the provision of administrative services for the department; and the disposition of

veterans' appeals. The requested increase of \$1,371,000 over the amount available in 1951 is the result of maintaining on a full year basis the rate of activity within the Executive Office of the Secretary achieved by the end of fiscal year 1951; the need for 83 additional positions in the Office of Naval Material to expand the staff engaged in the review of major material programs and policies as they relate to the support of strategic requirements, giving consideration to rates of use and attrition, inventory levels, and the relative priority; and the increased staff required for coordinating and directing the procurement activities of the Navy. The specific organizations covered in the request are the immediate offices of the Secretary, Under Secretary, Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Air and the Administrative Assistant to the Secretary of the Navy; the Offices of Industrial Relations, Naval Material, Comptroller, General Counsel, Information, Naval Petroleum Reserves, and Management Engineer; Administrative Office; and certain boards established to assist the Secretary on matters of promotion, retirement, and the like involving military and former military personnel.

Activity No. 9, "Records Administration," for which \$1,915,000 is requested to furnish the financial support for the Naval Records Management Centers, where inactive and semi-current records of the Naval establishment are stored and serviced until they can be disposed, in accordance with predetermined schedules, by transfer to the National Archives or otherwise. The request also supports the program for the District Records Management Offices located at District and River Command Headquarters to assist the operating forces in controlling the creation, maintenance and use of records in the conduct of current business.

Activity No. 10, "Contingencies of the Navy," for which \$42,127,000 is requested provides funds for travel of members of Congress in connection with inspection of Navy activities, miscellaneous current expenses such as the extra travel expenses of the Secretary, the Under Secretary and Assistant Secretaries of the Navy, and necessary expenses in connection with official functions such as visits of distinguished guests and other extraordinary military expenses. The estimate is based on the experience of past years and anticipates additional expenditures for these purposes as the result of the expansion of Naval facilities taking place during the budget year.

The committee recommends a reduction of \$1,950,000 in this request for appropriation in the belief that by better management of the civilian employment at least 600 man-years of employment can be dispensed with and the program handled efficiently.

OPERATION AND CONSERVATION OF NAVAL PETROLEUM RESERVES

The general purposes of the appropriation "Operation and Conservation of Naval Petroleum Reserves" for which \$11,908,000 is requested is to enable the Secretary of the Navy to carry out the provisions of law requiring him to explore, prospect, conserve, develop, use and operate the naval petroleum and oil shale reserves for naval purposes. Funds are requested herein for continuing the program for exploration, conservation, development, and operation of the naval petroleum reserves; for allocation to the United States Geological Survey to pay for that agency's lease supervision in Naval Petroleum

Reserve No. 2; for employment of expert consultants on petroleum technical matters; for field office maintenance; and for necessary civilian and military travel.

The appropriation request is divided into three activities as follows: Activity 1—"Field Administration" for which \$108,000 is requested. This program provides for maintaining the office of the Inspector, Naval Petroleum Reserves in California, who is the field representative of the director; and for the reestablishment of the office of Inspector at Casper, Wyoming, for Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 3 and the Naval Oil Shale Reserves who will act in the same capacity as the Inspector in California; for the employment of expert consultants to the director; and for allocation of funds to the U. S. Geological Survey, principally for personal services.

Activity No. 2, "Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 1," for which \$11,500,000 is requested to provide for carrying out the program for exploration and development of Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 1 (Elk Hills), California. Of this amount, \$4,000,000 is requested for the construction of a natural gasoline plant and \$1,500,000 for the necessary gathering lines thereto. It is essential that this plant and gathering facilities be available to handle the natural gas made available from the Stevens Zone to avoid a serious waste of gas, natural gasoline and other important by-products. It is estimated that the value of the natural gasoline and by-products processed by the plant on the basis of full production of 30,000 barrels per day from the Stevens Zone would amount to approximately \$2 million a year. This plant is designed to process 50 million cubic feet of wet gas per day and to provide facilities for injecting the dry gas into the Shallow and Stevens Zones for reservoir pressure maintenance. This estimate of cost was prepared by the Standard Oil Company of California as operator of the field, and reviewed by the Navy. The sum of \$5,150,000 is requested for the drilling of 54 wells in the Deep Well Zone and 47 wells in the Shallow Zone. The remaining \$850,000 of the request under subactivity 2 is requested for the operation and maintenance of Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 1 (Elk Hills), California, to have the field in a state of constant readiness to produce its maximum in a period of national emergency.

Activity No. 3, "Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 3," for which \$300,000 is requested to provide funds for the drilling of two test wells into the deeper horizons of Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 3 (Teapot Dome), Wyoming. For some time, this Reserve has been completely inactive but wells drilled adjacent to the southern boundaries indicate production in the deeper horizons and knowledge of the potential and the development of these reserves is felt to be essential in view of the present national emergency. The request for funds is based upon the cost of similar wells drilled in the areas surrounding the reserve.

It was stated that the operation of the Naval Petroleum Reserves has consistently returned a profit to the Treasury as the sale of products from this reserve has returned money in excess of that required to operate the reserves.

LANGUAGE CHANGES, NAVY

Under the headings "Military Personnel, Navy" and "Military Personnel, Marine Corps", previous language covering hire of quarters

has been deleted as unnecessary, since permanent statutory authority exists for the hiring of quarters to house personnel.

Under the heading "Aircraft and Facilities", language has been included to provide for the expenditure of funds under the appropriation "Aviation, Navy, 1949" to pay for contracts made during fiscal year 1949 for aircraft equipment and research and development.

Under the new heading "Shipbuilding and Conversion", new language has been inserted to provide for the expenditure of funds for instruction, acquisition or conversion of vessels under the shipbuilding program authorized by Public Law 3 of the Eighty-second Congress. Provision of funds for armor and armament for these vessels appears under the new heading "Ordnance for Shipbuilding and Conversion."

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

GENERAL STATEMENT

Air power of today's version consists of well trained people, up-to-date equipment, and adequate bases. Funds recommended herein are to provide personnel, to modernize present equipment and procure new equipment of the latest types, and to increase the capacity and modernize bases so that the newest type aircraft can properly be cared for. The Air Force provides a very powerful striking arm for our military forces. With the atomic weapons it is the most powerful striking force ever placed in the hands of any nation.

To accomplish the objectives upon which Air Force plans and requirements were built the Secretary of the Air Force stated that funds were required—

To have in being as soon as practicable a modernized 95-wing Air Force with proper balance, subject to the limitations discussed, between strategic, tactical, air defense, and support units.

To secure the necessary personnel and train them to a state of readiness while procuring and providing them with weapons and equipment to insure to the maximum the accomplishment of their mission with the least possible loss of life.

To reach and continue a level of maintenance, with necessary spare parts support, to enable an alert status and permit instantaneous retaliation.

To procure aircraft, weapons, electronics, and other major equipment, as well as reserve tooling for long-lead-time items, at a rate which will permit immediate expansion in case of war.

To accelerate basic research and development in order to speed to the use of our combat men the best we can conceive and build for them in items of aircraft, weapons, and equipment. Enemy equipment already encountered in Korea lends urgent emphasis to this phase of our effort.

To rebuild the Reserve components, Air Reserve and Air National Guard, presently depleted through recalls to active duty in their country's service, as to personnel strength, adequate equipment, and state of training to insure their readiness if need be.

Details relating to programs will be found under appropriate headings in the following pages of this report, and a breakdown of financial requests and recommendations will be found in the table beginning (for the Department of the Air Force) on page 156 of this report.

Investigations of the committee reveal that there has been widespread abuse of the use of Air Force planes by officers not engaged in strictly official duty flying. The committee feels that the most rigid economy must be exercised in this field as it costs large sums of money

to operate expensive aircraft. Reductions have been made in the bill looking to higher efficiency in this field.

The committee raises a question concerning the present rules prescribed for personnel assigned to the performance of strictly administrative duties under the provisions of the "incentive pay for the performance of hazardous duties" and feels that consideration should be given to a duty period of a limited time out of the year, in which time the airman or officer may be kept abreast of flight developments and procedures. Should this procedure be adopted such personnel would not be in flying pay status for more than a portion of each year and large sums would be saved. The committee realizes that such a policy would have to be worked out and administered with the greatest of care.

AIRCRAFT AND RELATED PROCUREMENT

The request for appropriation under this heading in the amount of \$11,717,000,000 includes \$625,000,000 to liquidate prior contract authority, leaving for new obligating authority \$11,092,000,000 to finance the procurement of new aircraft, together with such related activities as guided missiles, industrial mobilization and procurement personnel. The program is based upon a continuation of the planned expansion to 95 wings initiated in the preceding fiscal year and provides concurrently the normal related peacetime attrition and mobilization capability as developed under plans and industrial preparedness programs. In addition to aircraft ready to fly away from the manufacturer's plant, the program includes funds for spare components and spare parts, components required for training purposes, ground handling equipment, service test material and preproduction costs. The requirements for aircraft procurement include such factors as aircraft attrition losses, obsolescence, missions, and new developments. Since the lead time to procure aircraft deliveries is approximately eighteen months, the number of planes to be budgeted by years must be planned accordingly to provide sufficient time for procurement to be initiated so that ultimate deliveries will meet the planned time schedule. Other requirements included in the request are for major modifications; guided missiles; industrial mobilization; and procurement and production administration.

The request for the \$11,092,000,000 mentioned above is divided into seven direct obligations, the first of which is:

Program 110, Aircraft Complete, for which \$4,957,360,000 is requested, is to provide for the procurement of aircraft ready to be flown away from the air frame contractor's plant. The costs reflected in the request cover not only the cost of manufacturing the air frame but also the cost of equipping it with the engines, instruments, armament systems, weapons, radios, etc., which are procured directly by the Air Force and shipped to the air frame contractors for installation. The request covers the financing of 5,604 aircraft in fiscal year 1952 plus funds to complete the financing of 3,092 aircraft originally planned during fiscal year 1951. In January 1951 orders were placed for 3,092 aircraft in order that valuable time not be lost in building the necessary mobilization base required to expand the Air Force to the approved

95 wing level. Funds were not available to completely finance the expanded program but under approved procedures orders were placed for the aircraft, each manufacturer being limited to a minimum down payment sufficient to get time consuming preliminaries under way on a limited scale. \$330,000,000 was included in the Fourth Supplemental Appropriation Act to cover such down payments. To complete the financing of these aircraft \$1,514,966,441 is requested in the present bill. For 5,604 aircraft, which is the fiscal year 1952 requirement, \$3,442,393,559 is requested herein. These planes will continue the build up to be 95 wing level at currently planned accelerated production rates. Included in the fly away costs is the air frame proper, the various install components including engines, propellers, weapons, electronics, photographic and armament items, and provision for engineering changes and freight costs for shipping these components to the aircraft manufacturer.

Program 120, initial aircraft components spares and spare parts, for which \$4,197,035,000 is requested, covers such items as initial spare components and spare parts required for the operation of the aircraft for the first year. Quantities of spares required after the first year are provided by the maintenance and operation appropriation. The initial quantities, although described as one year, actually must be in sufficient quantities to satisfy the first year's consumption; establish the basic stock levels; build a pipe line for deployment overseas; and provide spares and spare parts for the ply weight kits and for a period of approximately sixty days to permit stock levels to be built up at the proper stations. The spare parts requirements takes into consideration the increase flying hour activity associated with the Air Force expansion. Sizable savings accrue from procuring parts at the time the aircraft is contracted for, partially because of quantity considerations, but primarily because procurement in later years frequently requires reopening of production lines. \$1,643,819,134 of the request herein is to provide spares and spare parts for the 3,092 aircraft mentioned in project 110 above and \$2,553,215,866 apply to the 5,604 aircraft under the 1952 program.

Program 130, which for purposes of consideration is divided into five projects requests an over-all total for appropriation of \$1,478,025,000. The first of the projects for consideration is that of "Industrial Machinery; Equipment and Facilities", for which \$1,109,497,000 is requested and provides for the expansion of industrial machinery and factory capacity necessary to produce the aircraft required for the build up to a 95 wing level and for rapid expansion in the event of full mobilization. It is the policy of the Air Force to spread across industry as widely as possible contracts for their requirements in order to broaden the industrial base of the procurement program; to provide equitable distribution of procurement contracts among the maximum number of competent suppliers; and to utilize to the maximum extent the present and potential industrial capacity. The heavy pressed program for which \$197,000,000 of the above amount is requested is a joint undertaking of the three military services to be financed through Air Force appropriations. Through its establishment new production techniques will be developed. The new tech-

niques will enable aircraft to be produced at higher rates with lower expenditures of money and man hours.

The next project is "Training Items", for which \$103,679,000 is requested. This project provides aircraft spare component equipments and parts of the newest types to be used for training purposes and contemplates the use of approximately 1 percent of the fly away cost of aircraft for training purposes. Most of the training equipments are supplied to the training command for basic and general instruction and the remainder is devoted to the various commands required to perform on the job training.

The next project, Aircraft Ground Handling Equipment, for which \$235,598,000 is requested, is to provide such items as special tools, test equipment and ground handling equipment necessary to operate the 5,604 new aircraft to be procured from the fiscal year 1952 funds requested in this bill. The special tools and test equipments are manufactured by the contractors who make the air frame or aircraft components to which they relate. The portable ground handling equipment necessary for servicing and handling the new aircraft on the flight line may be procured from a variety of sources. The estimate includes items such as aircraft towing equipment, portable power plants, stand and cradle assemblies for engine repairs, turntables, generators, etc.

The next project, Preproduction Costs, for which \$6,564,000 is requested, is to provide for items which require preliminary contracts in anticipation of production contracts in subsequent years. It includes such items as production engineering, tool planning, mark ups, etc.

The last project under this program, Service Test Material, for which \$22,687,000 is requested, is to provide for the procurement of equipment, components or contractual services necessitated by the requirements of service testing. All new equipment must be service tested to prove its suitability. These new equipments may be the result of Air Force research, or of commercial developments, or of new applications of old principles as distinct from research. Service test items are procured in small quantities sufficient to prove the feasibility and adaptability of the equipment to the operational or tactical requirements.

Program 140, Major Modification Modernization of Aircraft, for which \$263,420,000 is requested, is to provide for major modification of in service aircraft to make them more effective for combat, training and general Air Force use; to correct known major deficiencies that have been discovered through service use and test; and to extend the Air Force utilization of its aircraft now in service. The modifications consist of alterations to engines, air frames, armament systems, and may change the purpose for which the aircraft was previously used; extend or renew the first line of the useful life of the aircraft; change its configuration; cause a major change in the characteristics of the components, or revise its military characteristics by installing new type of equipment required for Air Force operations. The unit costs of modification include prime equipment spare parts and contractual

labor required to accomplish the modification but not the labor costs for modification accomplished by Air Force personnel.

Program 150, Guided Missiles, for which \$130,000,000 is requested, is divided into six separate project for convenience of consideration. The first of these is the guided missiles complete, for which \$50,283,000 is budgeted, and is to provide for complete guided missiles which are required for the various stages of operational testing, training and activation of tactical units of the four basic categories of missiles, which are first, air launch against air target; second, air launch against surface targets; third, surface launch against surface targets; and fourth, surface launch against air targets. Detailed information concerning guided missiles has not been made available to the public, but the committee devoted considerable time to this most interesting subject and was assured that, in estimating the cost reflected in the request for complete missiles, the latest available cost data including estimates from contractors was used and consideration was given to cut reduction in costs should appear as a result of increased production quantities.

The next project under the program, Initial Components Spares and Spare Parts, for which \$2,376,000 is budgeted, is to provide a limited quantity of spares and spare parts for replacement which operating experience has demonstrated are required due to breakage in transit, handling during assembly and replacement caused by malfunction during firing. The request represents the best and latest estimates of the contractors and operating activities engaged in firing of the missiles.

The next project, Preproduction Planning and Facilities, for which \$24,058,000 is requested, provides for preproduction planning and tooling, industrial machinery and equipment, installation of such equipment and expansion of public and private plants and facilities incident to the production of guided missiles. The funds requested are based on studies performed by the industrial planning division of the Air Force and contractors estimates of the space requirements and tooling and equipment required to expand production capacity to meet the requirements of the guided missile program.

The next project, Modification and Modernization of Guided Missiles, for which \$732,000 is budgeted, provides for the modification and modernization of missiles, previously accepted by the Air Force, for which it has been economically advisable to alter the present configuration, guided system, etc., to improve the operational efficiency of the missile.

The next project, Auxiliary Equipment, for which \$52,551,000 is requested, is to provide for the procurement of auxiliary equipment required to support the guided missile program, such as launchers, auxiliary guidance, electronic ground check equipment, armament components, ground handling equipment, and technical make-up; and the modification of aircraft used as target aircraft, parent aircraft and director aircraft and special fuel. The quantities of such auxiliary equipment are closely related to the total number of complete guided missiles, being procured and the number of operational units for which this auxiliary equipment is to support. As in the other projects under this program the fund requirements are based on previous costs for

identical or similar items previously procured, and on Air Force and contractors estimates for items of equipment newly developed.

Program 180, Industrial Mobilization, for which \$9,380,000 is requested, represents the portion of the industrial mobilization program of the Munitions Board which is assigned to the Air Force. The reduction from \$79,840,000 in fiscal year 1951 to the amount requested herein reflects the impact of the current procurement program and the resultant expansion of production facilities. The program is divided into four projects, the first of which is—

Reserve Plants, for which \$900,000 is budgeted, is to cover the cost for maintenance and protection of two plants, one at Omaha, Nebraska, which is used primarily for storage for a portion of the Air Force machine tool and production equipment reserve; the other at Adrian, Michigan, which is required for formal maintenance and protection to be ready in case of need.

The next project under this program is, Reserve Machine Tools and Production Equipment, for which \$1,731,000 is requested, which is to cover the cost of maintenance and rehabilitation operations at Air Force storage sites, and for preparation for shipment, warehousing, stock control, administration and security, etc, of the 30,000 major items of machine tool and production equipment reserve at the various sites.

The next project, Industry Preparedness Program, for which \$6,000,000 is requested, is to cover studies and programs looking to measures for the elimination or reduction of critical material; measures designed to develop basic production methods and processes utilizing newly developed techniques; measures concerning newly developed items for which volume production technique will be needed; and measures for the continuation or completion of projects already under way, for which substantial sums have been expended and work accomplished that will be wasted unless the project is completed.

The last project in the program is Mobilization Planning and Administration, for which \$749,000 is requested, is cover necessary current modifications of production allocation plans with industry, completion or continuation of existing projects, and development of necessary plans and studies relating to items emerging from the research and development program. The estimate provides \$708,600 for 150 man-years of employment and \$38,000 for travel, and \$2,400 for employers' contributions under the Social Security Act.

Program 190, Procurement and Production Administration, for which \$56,780,000 is requested, is to provide funds for the pay of some 12,000 man-years of employment of civilian personnel required in procurement and production, industrial auditing and contract renegotiation of the Air Force, including funds for travel, communication service, rents and utilities, contractual services and supplies and materials for said personnel.

In this appropriation the committee was presented with a request for 6,500 additional man-years of civilian employment over the requirement for fiscal year 1951. The employment during that year was on an ascending scale with 11,040 persons being employed on June 30, 1951, the end of the fiscal year. It is estimated that employment

at the end of fiscal year 1952 will be 12,520. The committee recommends a reduction of 300 man-years of civilian employment and a dollar reduction in this item of \$1,200,000. This is done in an effort to obtain a more economical utilization of manpower. The Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower and Personnel testified that there is a terrific wastage of manpower in the defense effort and that efforts were being made to do something about it. The committee is lending what aid it can.

A further reduction of \$500,000,000 is recommended in this appropriation due to the fact that the production of one or two models of aircraft have not progressed as rapidly as anticipated due to lag in securing some of the component parts. It is anticipated that the production difficulties will be overcome by removal of certain bottlenecks, but original schedules cannot be completely restored during this fiscal year. This action will in no way slow down the program of aircraft procurement but, in so doing, the committee is being realistic as to present accomplishments, anticipating that requests for additional amount to procure improved models of the aircraft will be approved upon request.

MAJOR PROCUREMENT OTHER THAN AIRCRAFT

Appropriations requested for major procurement other than aircraft in the amount \$1,800,000,000 is for the procurement of major items of equipment required in support of the 95 wing Air Force. A major item of equipment as contained in this estimate is defined as a complete "end item" of high dollar cost which represents capital expenditure required to equip the Regular Air Force, the Air Force Reserve and the R. O. T. C. to accomplish their military missions.

Program 210, Weapons and Ammunition, for which \$601,770,000 is requested, is to provide funds for combat, training, and service test types of ammunition, and includes rockets and their components, bombs and components, chemical items, guided missiles having the performance characteristics of ammunition, cartridges, shells and miscellaneous. The ammunition is required to equip the troops with standard small arms authorized for their missions; to provide ammunition for normal training of crews; to service test newly developed ammunition and small arms to determine their effectiveness, with the aim of utilizing the latest scientific advancements, thereby providing the most efficient and effective munitions obtainable; and to have specific types of combat ammunition on hand to support our immediate striking power concept until production from industry can match combat consumption.

Program 220, Ground Power and Marine Equipment, for which \$468,398,000 is requested, is divided into six projects for convenience of description and consideration, the first of which is General purpose vehicles for which \$188,113,000 is budgeted. General purpose vehicles, as differentiated from special purpose vehicles, are those used by the Air Force in transportation of military personnel and material within the Air Force activities in support of the 95 wing Air Force. Commercial type vehicles are used in the zone of the interior and specified areas outside the zone of the interior in lieu

of the more expensive tactical type vehicle. Such vehicles are to be procured under this request as are vehicles to complete the implementation of 42 engineer aviation battalions to be activated during fiscal year 1952; to provide for replacements complete procurement of vehicles for certain projects; to provide new bases with minimum requirements; and to provide for the issuance of complete equipment to units scheduled for deployment overseas.

The next project under the program, Special Purpose Vehicles, for which \$187,147,000 is requested, is for the procurement of vehicles restricted by design or overall characteristics to an individual application such as, fuel and oil servicing trucks and trailers, oxygen generating trailers and trucks, aircraft towing tractors, and such vehicles as have incorporated specifications developed by the military and as such do not have commercial counterparts. Whenever standard ordnance vehicles or commercial type vehicles will meet a requirement it is the policy of the Air Force to utilize such vehicles rather than incur the expense of developing specifications which would result in more expensive types of vehicles.

The next project, Railroad Equipment, for which \$2,879,000 is requested is to provide for the procurement of railroad rolling stock such as locomotives, gondolas, box and flat cars and necessary equipment required in the activation of 5 new bases during fiscal year 1952 and to permit return of items now overdrawn to the Army-Air Force pool.

The next project, Construction Equipment, for which \$39,016,000 is requested, is for the procurement of construction equipment for the modernization of 16 engineer aviation battalions, activation of 26 new battalions, and the augmentation of the entire 42 organizations to include bituminous, quarry or concrete equipment.

The next project, Materials Handling Equipment, for which \$3,317,000 is requested, is for the procurement of material handling equipment consisting of crane type trucks, fork lifts, platform and straddle type trucks, cranes, industrial warehouse tractors, and for the replacement of equipment that has become uneconomically repairable through wear and tear.

The project for Marine Equipment for which \$47,926,000 is requested, is to provide utility boats for the transportation of passengers, cargo, fuel, supplies, etc., and are assigned in accordance with approved programs and agreements formulated with the Navy. It also provides for rescue boats in accordance with the build up to 95 wings. It is estimated that a 50 percent replacement of the present inventory is desired to complete the total requirement for the boat program by the end of fiscal year 1952.

Program 230, Electronics and Communications Equipment, for which \$384,167,000 is requested has been divided into 7 projects for clarity of description and consideration. It covers generally the electronics and communications modernization program to equip the combat ready force and supporting units of the expanded 95 wing Air Force. It represents a continuation of the program started in fiscal year 1951; the increased requirements during that year and the present fiscal year are due to the expansion program resulting from the current international situation. The expenditure of the increased

amounts during the two fiscal years will build up the production base in the field of electronics to a volume capacity most essential in the event it is needed in the immediate future. In order to keep pace with aircraft of the latest design with higher speed and longer range capabilities, forces must be equipped with new and improved electronics and communications such as an all weather capability; air defense, early warning, tactical ground support, and fighter control; offensive and defensive electronics warfare; tactical air-ground communications; and a secure and effective communication system for control of combat and logistic operations on a global scale.

The first project under this program, Aerial Communication System, for which \$40,000,000 is budgeted, is to provide for the procurement of airborne and ground ultra high frequency radar equipments, and equipments required to support the establishment of additional installations and special augmentation programs. The ultra-high frequency conversion program is the Air Force portion of a combined Air Force-Navy program to convert air traffic control operations from the very high frequency spectrum to the ultra high frequency spectrum.

The project for Identification Systems for which \$37,000,000 is budgeted, will provide for the procurement of airborne and ground identification friend or foe equipments previously programmed, for additional requirements generated by the augmentation of special programs such as the aircraft control and warning system, air navigational aids, and the retrofit of aircraft with modern identification friend or foe devices not factory equipped.

The project, Command Communication System, for which \$26,000,000 is budgeted, will provide for the procurement of additional high powered radio communications equipment required to augment the global communication system and for the contractual service cost of installing equipments obtained from prior year procurements.

The project, Navigational Aids Systems, for which \$60,000,000 is budgeted, will provide for both airborne and ground radio and radar air navigational aid equipments required to equip aircraft with improved navigational aids and for the installation of modern ground equipments at active Air Force bases under the 95 Wing program, and the funds required for the contractual installation of equipments obtained from prior year procurements.

The project, Tactical Electronics Systems, for which \$132,167,000 is budgeted, will provide for the procurement of the additional radar and other electronics equipments required for the aircraft control and warning system (radar fence) and the augmented tactical control program, and the contractual service cost to install radar procured from prior year procurement.

The project, Communication Security Systems, for which \$19,000,000 is budgeted will provide for cryptographic devices required to equip Air Force communication centers and circuits with improved equipment to insure the secure handling of official classified messages over tactical and command communications channels.

The last project under this program, Communications Replacement Augmentation Program, for which \$70,000,000 is requested, will provide for the procurement of complete units of major components

of radio, radar, telephone, teletype, and facsimile equipments for the replacement or augmentation of existing facilities, and the replenishment of authorized equipment levels of radio and wire point to point circuits, telephone systems, navigational aids, air control and warning systems, cryptographic devices, air to ground radio stations, control towers and tactical and organizational support equipment in the major procurement category.

Program 250, Training Equipment, for which \$93,085,000 is requested, is concerned with major items of training equipment essential to both air and ground crews in transitioning to new types of aircraft and other equipment and in maintaining proficiency in aviation skills. It is divided into four projects the first of which, Mobile Training Units, for which \$3,613,000 is requested to cover the procurement costs of self-contained, portable units, of mobile training units composed of operative mockups of actual aircraft and guided missile systems such as the electrical system, fuel system, control system, et cetera, depicting the operation of each major component or system of individual aircraft models. The trainers are mounted in such a manner as to be readily transportable by air and are the most efficient method of training maintenance personnel and air crews in the operational features of new aircraft prior to tactical assignment of such aircraft, in the training of personnel newly assigned to squadrons in the maintenance of aircraft and related equipment utilized by such squadrons, and in the refresher training of personnel assigned to squadrons.

The project for Counterpart Training Devices, for which \$54,197,000 is requested, is to provide for the procurement of flight simulators, instrument trainers and gunnery trainers. Flight simulators duplicate the cockpit configuration, control pressures and flight characteristics of specified aircraft models, and simulates realistically any aircraft emergency that may be encountered by pilot or crew member such as engine failure and difficulties, high speed stalls, fuel line stoppages, wing or propeller icing, and air temperatures and density changes. The entire operational procedures of flight can be simulated in the trainer from takeoff to landing without the necessity of accomplishing this training in actual flight, resulting in savings in time, aircraft, and flight costs.

Instrument trainers simulate flight of jet and conventional type aircraft under instrument conditions, embodying complete aircraft instruments and related controls and incorporate provision for simulating radio signals of navigational ranges and blind landing systems, as well as recording systems for identifying student and pilot errors. Gunnery trainers simulate attacks by enemy aircraft and evaluate the ability of gunners to score hits upon attacking aircraft and teach proper procedures in connection with ranging, obtaining azimuth, elevation, and triggering.

The majority of instrument trainers are assigned to Air Force schools, while a few are utilized to maintain instrument proficiency of rated pilots. The funds requested in this project will provide 93 flight simulators, 46 instrument trainers, and 68 flexible gunnery trainers.

The project for Radio and Radar Trainers, for which \$30,657,000 is requested, is for the purchase of 257 radio and radar trainers that would simulate the operation in flight of radar controlled gunnery systems, long range navigation sets, short range navigation and precise bombing and mapping, and jamming of radar signals, and will provide ground training for gunners on the operation of radar controlled gunnery systems and evaluate accuracy, for navigators in the operation of complex navigational equipment, for simulating bomb approach runs and radar bombing of targets, for practice in differentiating between and in jamming of radar signals.

The last project in the program, Aerial Targets and Related Equipment, for which \$4,618,000 is requested will provide for the procurement of winged tow targets, radio controlled target airplanes, and necessary rotary launching devices.

Program 270, Other Major Equipment, for which \$252,580,000 is requested, covers the procurement of major complete end items of meteorological, radiological, photographic, printing and reproduction, tests, flying field, shop, and utility equipment, including first year spares requirement where such spares are normally furnished with the end item. The program is divided into eight projects the first of which is:

Meteorological Equipment, for which \$3,202,000 is requested, will provide for the replacement of meteorological and geophysical equipment determined to be inoperative through fair wear and tear, both ground installed and airborne, authorized for use in measuring, observing, recording, computing, for presenting atmospheric forecasts; for the initial procurement requirements for newly developed authorized equipment which will be required due to new improved operational techniques and rapid advancement of meteorological science; and for the initial issue required to support new organizations and installations in cognizance with the 95 wing all-weather Air Force.

The project, Radiological Equipment, for which \$9,905,000 is requested, is to continue the development of the Air Force capabilities for radiological defense against any attack. There are basically three difference types of equipment involved: Protection to an air crew in flight; protection to troops on the ground; and the equipment necessary for offensive or counter-offensive action against the enemy. This need has developed since the inception of atomic agents.

The project, Photographic Equipment, for which \$31,572,000 is requested will provide for the procurement of complete photographic equipment such as airborne and ground cameras, photographic lenses, printers, processing machines, mount assemblies, and for the replacement and augmentation of photographic equipment presently in use.

The project, Printing and Reproduction, for which \$3,110,000 is requested, provides for the procurement of complete units of printing and reproduction equipment, such as composing machines, printing presses, cutters, stitchers, and all other types of related machinery and equipment required in the operation of field printing plants, and continues the rehabilitation of unserviceable and obsolete equipment inaugurated in accordance with recommendations by the Congressional Joint Committee on Printing.

The project, Test Equipment, for which \$31,698,000 is requested, is to provide for the procurement of complete laboratory and test equip-

ment, including special and general purpose laboratory and shop test or inspection equipment, precision measuring and recording instruments such as gyro testers, propellor stand test stands, manometers, and analyzers.

The project, Flying Field and Shop Equipment, for which \$156,-754,000 is requested, provides for the procurement of all major flying and shop equipment such as portable hoists, jack assemblies, portable power plants, portable heaters, and all other types of major equipment required to service and maintain aircraft and related supporting equipment, and the procurement of all major shop and warehouse machinery and equipment, required to equip maintenance units and depots such as spray booths, air compressors, drill presses, furnaces, generators, grinders, hoists and lathes.

The project, Utilities Equipment, for which \$3,957,000 is requested, will provide for the procurement of major items of utilities equipment such as air conditioning plants, ice plants, water purification units, and other items of the portable type. Requirements under this estimate are based on the additional number of facilities to be activated and the buildup to 95 wings.

The committee recommends a reduction in this appropriation request of \$50,000,000 due to the fact that there is considerable lag time in some of the procurements which will, no doubt, be picked up at a later time.

MAINTENANCE AND OPERATIONS

The appropriation, Maintenance and operations, for which \$3,238,-700,000 is requested, is to provide for the maintenance and operation of the physical plant (fixed and mobile) and equipment, and for the performance of activities essential to the accomplishment of the military mission of the Air Force, including expenses of the Air Force Reserve and Air Force Reserve Officer Training Corps. For clarity and convenience of consideration the appropriation is divided into eight programs, the first of which is—

Operations of Aircraft, for which \$910,597,000 is requested, is divided into three projects the first of which is Aircraft Maintenance Spares, Spare Parts, and Supplies, for which \$546,729,000 is budgeted. This estimate provides for maintenance spares and spare parts of airplanes, engines, propellers and other aircraft accessories including airborne weapons and communications equipment procured for aircraft in service, and for stocking certain strategic reserves in keeping with existing war plans.

The project, Aircraft Fuel and Oil, for which \$273,518,000 is budgeted, is to provide for procurement of aviation fuel, lubricating oils and assist-take-off propellants; for first destination transportation; for services on fuels and lube oils world-wide; and, run requirements.

The project for Minor Modification and Modernization of Aircraft for which \$90,350,000 is requested is to provide for minor modification and modernization of aircraft, which includes such typical examples as correction of known deficiencies and failures of presently installed equipment; modifications necessary for installation of new equipment or new types of equipment, including incorporation in installed systems of adjustments thereof; work necessary to accommodate and utilize improved maintenance practices; and work necessary to in-

corporate safety of flight developments. The minor modifications are applicable to in-service aircraft and associated equipment, and to new aircraft and related equipment produced between the time improvement is authorized for accomplishment and the point of manufacture at which the modification can feasibly be incorporated in the production line. Funds requested in this estimate are also to be used to contract for accomplishment of certain minor modification and modernization projects by private manufacturers, and to procure equipment and supplies for those projects which are accomplished at organizational, field or depot levels by regular Air Force personnel.

Program 420, Organization, Base and Maintenance Equipment and Supplies, for which \$591,542,000 is requested, is generally to provide non-expendable minor equipment which can be repaired and made serviceable and for supplies which are consumed in use or converted in the process of construction or manufacture. These are generally items of across the board application subject to being used by virtually every individual, every organization and every installation of the Air Force, such as small powered tools with which an airman works, the desks in offices, special clothing, parachutes and equipage, minor items of navigational equipment, fuel and oil handling equipment, mess hall and kitchen equipment, laundry and dry cleaning equipment, items required for air field lighting, compressed gas cylinders, etc. The program is divided into six projects the first of which is:—

Organization, Base and Maintenance Equipment, for which \$250,000,000 is requested, is to provide for the procurement of certain items required for initial issue for new organizations, installations, and personnel; replacement through fair wear and tear; obsolescence; changes in tables of allowances and tables of organization and equipment; and requirements for the modernization and modification of ground equipment. Generally the items of equipment included in this estimate are non-expendable items of property which may be expected to have the period of service of one year or more after put into use without material impairment of physical condition.

The project for Organization, Base and Maintenance Equipment, Reserve, for which \$989,000 is budgeted, is for the procurement of centrally procured items for 15 Air Force Reserve Training Centers and for the initial procurement of equipment to complete the Volunteer Air Reserve training unit program for administrative equipment.

The project for Organization, Base and Maintenance Equipment, Air Reserve Officers Training Corps, for which \$1,135,000 is requested is for the procurement of items of equipment necessary for instructional purposes by the Air Reserve Officers Training Corps institutional program.

The project for Organization, Base and Maintenance Equipment and Supplies, for which \$338,381,000 is requested, is to provide funds for the procurement of items of supply required in support of equipment authorized for both the zone of the interior and overseas.

Program 430, Logistical Support, for which \$828,235,000 is requested, is to provide pay of civilian personnel, contractual services, and local purchase of supplies necessary for depot maintenance of an average of approximately 14,700 aircraft, special-purpose vehicles, and equip-

ment; operation of the Air Force depot supply system; commercial transportation incident to the distribution of material; support of the aeronautical chart and information service; commercial and government printing; and maintenance and operation of Air Force installations that support the 32 Air Force depots and allied activities scheduled for the zone of interior and overseas. Similar support for the Air Force reserve and Air Reserve Officers' training corps programs is included.

The project for Depot Maintenance, for which \$392,833,000 is budgeted, is to cover payment of civilian personnel, temporary duty travel of military and civilian personnel, contractual services, and locally procured supplies and equipment utilized in maintenance, aircraft storage functions, and powered ground equipment storage functions beyond the capabilities of using organizations and installations. It also provides for materials, other than locally procured, which are used in aircraft storage functions. It includes repair, overhaul, modification, reclamation, manufacture, assembly and disassembly, inspection, testing, and preparation for shipment, and for storage and removing from storage including reconditioning upon removal from storage. Of the amount requested, \$251,666,000 is requested for the payment of 76,405 man-years of personal services.

The project for Depot Supply Operations, for which \$121,856,000 is requested, is to provide for 38,688 man-years of civilian personal services at a cost of \$112,570,000, for travel of civilian and military personnel assigned to depot supply organizations, contractual services, and locally procured equipment and supplies for accomplishing depot supply operations for the Air Force. The estimate also includes funds for the Air Force share of operating expenses of the Armed Forces Petroleum Purchasing Agency.

The Project for Distribution of Materiel, Other Than First Destination, for which \$122,082,000 is requested, is to provide for the distribution of material, other than first destination, including transportation and accessorial expenses incident thereto, commercial terminal charges, stevedoring, etc. Transportation as represented in this estimate covers movement by commercial air, highway, railway, express, parcel post, and military Sea Transportation Service.

The project for Printing and Reproduction, for which \$18,223,000 is requested, is to provide for printing and reproduction requirements that come within the scope of Title 44, United States Code, and the regulations of the Joint Congressional Committee on Printing. Title 44, U. S. C., requires that all printing which originates at the headquarters of a Federal agency, be procured at or through the Government Printing Office. The regulations of the Joint Congressional Committee on Printing authorize the procurement of certain field printing from commercial sources. Therefore, there are two categories of printing and reproduction, namely: Departmental printing, which is procured from the Government Printing Office, from commercial printers on waiver issued by the Public Printer, and from the Department of Defense Printing Service Plant; and contract field printing which originates in the field and which is procured by special authorization of the Congressional Joint Committee on Printing from commercial sources or on a reimbursable basis from printing plants of other Government departments. Subsequent projects provide

printing and reproduction for the reserves in the amount of \$150,000 and for the Reserve Officer Training Corps in the amount of \$240,000.

The project for Aeronautical Chart and Information Service for which \$11,920,000, is requested is to provide for operation of the Aeronautical Chart and Information Service including civilian personal services, temporary duty travel, permanent change of station movements of civilian personnel, local procurement of supplies and other operating expenses directly incident to the compilation, reproduction, storage, and distribution of aerial charts and target materials. The estimate includes 1,850 civilian manyears of employment at a cost of \$6,384,000 and \$3,356,000 for contractual services with other Government agencies and civilian firms.

The project for Base Operations and Maintenance, for which \$148,644,000 is requested is to provide funds for expenses incident to the operation and maintenance of installations which provide base services to area depots, specialized depots, and storage points essential to the logistical support of the Air Force program and includes funds for base operations and maintenance of activities necessary for the operational mission including tactical reconnaissance, fighter interception, troop carrier and transport services, strategic bombardment, air weather service, and airways and air communications service organizations located on logistical support installations as tenants.

The project for Major Repairs and Minor Construction, for which \$12,000,000 is requested, is to provide for major repairs and minor construction for logistical support installations, covering maintenance work which is beyond the scope of current day to day maintenance. The plant facilities utilized in the logistical support program are largely industrial-type buildings used for depot storage and maintenance activities. The expansion of the Air Force, requiring the rehabilitation and utilization of unused facilities at depot installations, accounts for the principal portion of this request.

Program 440, Training Support, for which \$248,710,000 is requested, is to provide all expenses necessary to train personnel of the Regular Air Force, Air Force Reserve, and Air Reserve Officers Training Corps. Training of Regular Air Force personnel consists of indoctrination training for those entering without prior military service; technical training in specialized fields such as electronics, communications, and aircraft maintenance; flying training, to produce pilots, navigators, observers, and other specialists performing flight duties; and military professional training designed to qualify personnel for planning, administrative, and command positions of greater responsibility. The estimate provides for a maximum indoctrination training load of 72,000, compared with 51,000 during 1951 and 16,500 in 1950. Technical training loads in Air Force Schools will increase from 25,000 in 1950 and 57,000 during 1951 to a peak of 73,000 during 1952. Pilot training will reach an annual rate of 7,200 pilots during 1952, compared with 5,400 during 1951. A total of 47 major active installations will be required to support the training program by the end of 1952, representing an increase of 26 over the number in operation at the end of 1950 under the 48 Group program. Air Force reservists will receive training at 30 reserve training centers and at approximately 550 volunteer reserve locations. The Air Reserve Officers Training Corps program will increase from 125 units in 1951

to 187 in 1952. The program for clarity of consideration and description is divided into several projects the first of which is:—

Air Combat Maneuvers, for which \$2,500,000 is requested, is to provide for air combat maneuvers and exercises designed to measure and test the readiness of Air Force units to accomplish their assigned combat missions; and to provide training and air mobility, Arctic, amphibious, mountain, airborne and air defense operations. The primary objective of these maneuvers is the deployment of tactical units into the field to operate under conditions simulating those found in wartime under extreme weather conditions; or from advanced bases, far from home stations, which require long lines of logistic and communications support. The maneuvers consist of 14 exercises, 8 of which are joint exercises, including 7 in collaboration with The Department of the Army and one with both the Department of the Army and Department of the Navy, in which the Air Force provides the maximum utilization of air support in one or more roles.

The project for Schools and Training, for which \$50,600,000 is requested, is to provide for indoctrination training; technical training; flying training; and military professional training. The indoctrination training consists in the reception of recruits, and the basic military instruction of all airmen, other than reservists, entering the Air Force. A student load of 68,200 is anticipated for fiscal year 1952. Technical training encompasses a broad field of specialized instruction including courses in radio, electronics, fixed wire communications, armament, photography, aircraft and engine mechanics, engineering and administration. A peak load of 82,500 is anticipated for fiscal year 1952. The flying training program includes preflight, basic and advanced pilot training; liaison, helicopter and pilot instructor training; and 18 other courses, including such varied fields as aerial observer bombardment, navigation, complete fighter and bomber combat crew and aircraft controller. Under this program the undergraduate pilot training rate will increase from 4,000 in fiscal year 1951 to 7,200 in fiscal year 1952; the observer training rate will increase from 3,000 to 5,000 during the same period. Basic flying training will be conducted at 13 Air Force installations of which ten will be operated by civilian contract. Military professional training conducted by the Air University will increase in student load from 1,500 in fiscal year 1951 to 1,700 by the end of fiscal year 1952. The estimated number of graduates will be approximately 5,500 as compared with 4,000 anticipated during fiscal year 1951.

The project for Training Supplies and Services, for which \$40,000,000 is requested, is to provide for the procurement of training equipment, training supplies, training and technical literature, and contractual services of technical representatives. Under this project \$19,331,000 is budgeted for training equipment; \$4,749,000 for training supplies; \$2,373,000 for training manuals and technical literature; and \$13,147,000 for technical representatives. Technical representatives will provide such services as operator technicians and technical instructors in connection with the use of new, complicated types of equipment, particularly in the electronics and communications field.

Funds are provided for the Air Force Reserve and the Air Reserve Officers Training Corps for training supplies and services comparable to those provided for the regular forces in the amount of \$245,000

for the Air Force Reserve and \$900,000 for Air Reserve Officers Training Corps.

The project for Organizational Movements for Training, for which \$8,000,000 is requested, is to provide for expenses, primarily per diem and transportation costs, incident to organizational movements for training. It is estimated that \$6,289,000 of the funds requested herein will be required to move, on a rotational basis, 18 wings of the Strategic Air Command for temporary assignment at overseas destinations.

The project for Operation of Air Force Reserve Officers Training Corps Facilities (Institutions and Summer Camps), for which \$1,710,000 has been requested, is to provide for the operation of Air Force Reserve Officers Training Corps activities at educational institutions and summer camps. The estimate is based upon an average institutional enrollement of freshman 35,021; sophomores 24,079; juniors 20,126; and seniors 13,209, a total of 92,445 students. This represents an increase of 21,145 students over the estimated average enrollement of 71,300 during fiscal year 1951. It is estimated that specialized career units will be established in 187 educational institutions throughout the United States, as compared with 125 units in educational institutions during fiscal year 1951.

The project for Base Operation and Maintenance, for which \$129,070,000 is requested, is to provide for the operation and maintenance of a year end total of 46 installations in support of the Air Force training program, which represents an increase of 15 installations over the number at the end of fiscal year 1951. It is estimated that flying training at 34 installations will cost \$82,856,000; technical training at 7 installations \$30,346,000; indoctrination training at 3 installations \$11,021,000; and professional training at 2 installations \$4,847,000.

The project for Major Repairs and Minor Construction, for which \$10,930,000 is requested, is to provide for major repairs, rehabilitation, modification and minor instructions of installations supporting the Air Force training program, and covers work which is beyond the capabilities of routine day-to-day maintenance. The expansion of the Air Force accounts for the principal portion of this estimate. \$9,130,000 of the estimate will be required for rehabilitation of former military installations which have been lying idle for a number of years with little maintenance or care and are generally in poor condition. The balance of the request of \$1,800,000 will be required to modify reactivated facilities to meet new requirements of the training mission and new training techniques.

Program 450, Operational support, for which \$333,100,000 is requested, is to provide funds for the operation and maintenance of installations and facilities in support and conduct of air operational missions and includes such items as strategic bombing, tactical reconnaissance, fighter escort, fighter interceptor, airborne troop carrier and transport services, tactical air support to ground troops, and the air defense of continental United States, including the operation of the aircraft warning system. The installation program to support the air operational mission includes the use of existing installations and facilities. Geographical locations influence the deployment in the air defense net as well as strategic unit deployment in the overseas areas. Such considerations are reflected in the fact that 48 of the 63 additional installations will be activated in overseas areas to sup-

port planned unit deployment. The remaining 15 installations to be activated in the continental United States will support those units which cannot be accommodated at existing installations. The program provides for a total of 215 major operational support installations, which is a net increase of 55 active installations. In addition to the maintenance and operation of major active installations it is necessary to provide facilities for such supporting functions as all weather service, airways and air communications service, and effective radar-early-warning system including the aircraft control and warning sites and filter centers.

Program 460, Research and Test Support, for which \$56,625,000 is requested, is to provide for the base maintenance and operations of research and development installations; and major repairs and minor constructions at such installations. Of the amount requested in this program, \$53,000,000 is estimated as the cost of providing maintenance and operation at research and development centers at the Patrick Air Force Base and satellite stations; Eglin Air Force Base and satellite stations; Kirtland Air Force Base; Arnold Engineering Development Center; Griffiss Air Force Base; Cambridge Research Laboratory; and the Research and Development Laboratory and Development Testing Activities located at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base; Edwards Air Force Base; and Holloman Air Force Base. The remaining \$3,000,000 of the program is to provide for major repair and minor construction for research and test support installation and maintenance work which is beyond the capabilities of routine day-to-day maintenance.

Program 470, Medical support, for which \$145,239,000 is requested contemplates the operation of 153 hospitals, 69 infirmaries, and 135 dispensaries with a normal capacity of 24,781 beds or an expanded capacity of 28,267 beds. The first project under this program, Medical Procurement and Supply Operations, for which \$877,000 is budgeted, is to provide the Air Force share of operation of the Armed Services Medical Procurement Agency.

The project for Medical Equipment and Supplies, for which \$96,119,000 is requested, is primarily to provide for the procurement of a selected list of critical and long lead time items, 802 in number, which will establish a portion of the medical matériel mobilization reserve being accomplished by the three military services. The Air Force has made no corresponding procurement in previous years. Included in the project also are funds to purchase the medical supplies needed to support medical facilities, the Air Force share of the support of the Department of Defense blood and blood derivatives program and the procurement of special-purpose vehicles such as ambulances.

The project for Education and Training, for which \$2,450,000 is requested, is to provide for the education and training of medical service personnel in the technical skills of medicine through the training of officers and airmen in military service schools, civilian institutions and Air Force medical treatment facilities. It will provide for post graduate training by the utilization of qualified, medical, dental and allied specialists on consultant and instructional basis.

The project for Medical support, for which \$7,130,000 is requested, is to provide medical services for Air Force military personnel at

Government and civilian agencies other than those of the Air Force when the Air Force facilities are not available to provide necessary medical and dental care.

The project for Medical Administration, for which \$1,623,000 is requested, is to provide for expenses incident to the administration of the medical service world wide, including the offices of the Air Surgeons in 13 major Air Force Commands both overseas and in the United States, the office of the Surgeon General, and field extension offices of the Surgeon General. It will provide for 374 man-years of employment, of which 277 man-years will be for the office of the Surgeon General, 27 man-years for physical evaluation boards and the Armed Services Medical Matériel and Specifications Committee, and the remainder in offices of the Air Surgeons of the major Air Force Commands.

The project for Operation and Maintenance of Medical Treatment Facilities, for which \$25,165,000 is requested, is to provide for the expenses incident to the operation and day to day maintenance of hospitals, infirmaries, dispensaries, and minor medical facilities. It includes temporary duty travel of medical service personnel, permanent change of station of civilian personnel, communications services, rental of equipment, local procurement of medical matériel, and contractual services. The largest single item of expenditure under the project is \$17,813,000 for 5,812 man-years of civilian personnel who will be employed in hospitals, infirmaries, and dispensaries, to augment the military staff. The civilian personnel are equivalent to approximately 20 percent of the total staffing requirement and represent the minimum extent to which civilians may be employed.

The project for Major Repairs and Minor Construction for \$9,691,000 is requested is to provide the repairs, rehabilitation, modification and construction of medical treatment facilities that can be rehabilitated and placed in an economically useable condition, and be acceptable for medical use.

The program for Service-Wide Support, for which \$128,377,000 is requested, is to provide for expenses incident to the administration and management of the Air Force at headquarters, United States Air Force and major command headquarters, including the leasing of Air Force-wide command and operational communications networks, services, and systems; maintenance and operation of missions and air attaches offices; and Air Force participation in joint international projects. A major portion of the funds, or \$106,930,000, is requested for Command Administration which provides funds for civilian personal services and temporary duty travel of civilian and military personnel, permanent change of station travel of civilian personnel reporting for overseas duty; for equipment and supply costs for headquarters; rental of equipment and contractual services for both headquarters, and major Air Force Commands, and reimbursements to other Government agencies for services performed which are allocable to Command administration and departmental level and other related expenses.

The committee recommends a reduction in this appropriation request of \$30,258,000 of which \$258,000 will be applied against the procurement of ambulances. Language permitting the purchase of ambulances is contained in the bill, and it is the purpose of the committee to permit the purchase of such vehicles in the number requested

but it is recommended that the less expensive type of ambulance which is uniformly used by the other Services and has been found adequate will, in the opinion of the committee, be satisfactory for Air Force needs.

A reduction of \$30,000,000 is recommended in funds for civilian personnel employment. Testimony was presented indicating that as of June 30, 1951 there were 231,156 civilian personnel employed under this appropriation, and that as of June 30, 1952 the number would be 295,364, an increase of 64,208. The committee feels that the Services have been extravagant in the utilization of civilian personnel and are recommending a reduction of 10,000 man-years of employment under this appropriation.

MILITARY PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS

The request for appropriations for Military Personnel Requirements is to provide for pay and allowances of all military personnel on extended active duty who are engaged in Air Force activities; permanent change of station movements of military personnel, dependents and organizations; subsistence supplies for issue as rations to enlisted personnel and to civilian employees whose contract of employment provides for subsistence at government expense; civilian clothing for enlisted personnel on duty in specific assignments which requires the wearing of civilian clothing and for personnel discharged other than honorably; and for other miscellaneous military personnel requirements such as, welfare and morale supplies, chaplain's supplies and equipment, expenses of courts, commissions and boards, expenses incident to the apprehension of deserters, and interest on soldier's deposits. The estimate as submitted was based upon a beginning troop strength of 850,000 and an ending strength of 1,061,000, the funds requested being \$3,076,700,000. During the hearings, which were not completed until after the close of fiscal year 1951, information was presented to the Committee to the effect that the strength ending fiscal year 1951 and the beginning fiscal year 1952 was not as high as expected, only 787,000. Accordingly, the Department revised its request by a reduction of approximately \$60,000,000 leaving a request for \$3,016,700,000 as the amount required for military personnel requirement of the Air Force for fiscal year 1952. The committee was informed that it was anticipated the ending strength of 1,061,000 would be attained by June 30, 1952.

The appropriation request is divided into five projects. The first is for pay and allowances, for which under the revised program request is made for \$2,608,209,000 and is to provide for pay and allowances of commissioned officers, warrant officers, female medical officers, enlisted personnel, and aviation cadets. Such pay and allowances are fixed by law and if the estimated strengths are reached these funds will be required for such purposes during fiscal year 1952.

The project for Movements—Permanent Change of Station—provides for movements of individuals from civil life and from other military service of first Air Force duty station, between or from training stations, rotation—organization and individual—separation and special conditions. The request under the revised estimate is \$178,983,000, which is an increase of \$13,036,000 over the original request for this purpose. The increase is due to added procurement travel,

training travel, overseas deployment travel and separation travel, due to the fact that the estimated troop strength at the beginning of the year was some 63,000 less than anticipated and therefore, greater costs will have to be incurred in the attainment of the year-end strength goal.

The project for Procurement of Subsistence Supplies, for which \$220,163,000 is requested, under the revised estimate is to provide for subsistence supplies for issue as rations to airmen and to civilian employees whose contract of employment provides for subsistence at government expense; Air Force reserve and Air National Guard patients who are hospitalized in regular Air Force medical facilities, and for the furnishing of meals to airmen under contract in areas where there are no government mess facilities available and where the payment of commuted rations would create a hardship on the airmen. The estimated cost of rations per day for zone of the interior is \$1.0645 and for overseas \$1.2185. The estimate is based upon the anticipated troop strength at these rates.

The project for Civilian Clothing for which \$1,091,000 is requested is to provide for civilian clothing allowances for airmen and personnel assigned to duties which require the wearing of civilian clothing in the performance of official duties, and includes allowances for airmen personnel assigned to air attaches, military missions, special investigations, intelligence activities or in countries where the wearing of civilian clothing is mandatory.

The project for Other Military Personnel Requirements for which \$8,441,000 is requested—a reduction of \$179,000 from the original estimate—is to provide for chaplain's supplies and equipment, welfare and morale supplies, apprehension of deserters, courts, commissions, and boards, payment of interest on enlisted air personnel deposits.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The appropriation request for Research and Development in the amount of \$425,000,000 is to cover the direct costs of the program, excluding pay and other related costs of military personnel and ordinary maintenance of research facilities. A major portion of the Air Force research and development work is carried out by contractual arrangements, mainly with industrial institutions; a smaller portion being carried out by use of other Governmental facilities or with the Air Force's own facilities. The Committee was informed that this program is closely coordinated with those of the other military departments, all of which are designed to provide the military forces with weapons, aircraft, and other equipment to qualify and provide performances superior of those of any potential enemy. The Air Force program has been developed in these three basic needs: first, to overcome qualitative deficiencies in weapons, weapons systems and technics; second, to accelerate the development of those weapons, weapons systems, or components, completion of which will substantially strengthen the Air Force; third, to maintain adequate exploration in the natural sciences for the purpose of increasing fundamental knowledge. Research is a long time requirement that must, of necessity, precede any development of components and weapons system. This activity, therefore, will utilize to the maximum extent the re-

search capabilities of other government agencies, such as the basic research in the field of aerodynamics as performed by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics; research in the field of computers as performed by the Bureau of Standards; and in other fields, by university and other nonprofit institutions.

RESERVE PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS

The appropriation request for Reserve Personnel Requirements in the amount of \$23,100,000 is to provide pay, travel allowances, subsistence and clothing for Air Force personnel and students enrolled in the Air Reserve Officers' Training Corps for training and instruction. The estimate is based upon a strength of 10,758 officers and 20,500 airmen to be assigned to the Organized Air Reserve by the end of fiscal year 1952. The Air Reserve Officers' Training Corps, which represents the largest source of junior officers for the Air Force, will be conducted at 187 colleges and universities on either a two or three semester basis during fiscal year 1952 with an average student load of approximately 92,445 per semester. In addition, approximately 13,000 advance course students will receive six weeks of summer training at 15 locations. It is estimated that the program will produce approximately 12,875 graduates during fiscal year 1952. It would be necessary to enroll a minimum of 65,516 freshmen at the beginning of each school year. A study of the 125 institutions in the program indicated that they could not produce the 27,750 graduates annually as required, accordingly 62 units were added to the program making a total of 187 colleges and universities in the program for fiscal year 1952. A proper apportionment among the 187 schools to be in the program, taking into account the potentialities of each, should insure the necessary 27,750 graduates.

The budget was prepared on the assumption that practically all of the colleges and secretary schools in the country could begin, as of approximately July 1, to operate on an accelerated, year around basis. It now appears that only a few institutions will begin an accelerated program this summer, the majority only offering their normal summer program. The Air Force ROTC program will be operated only at institutions which do accelerate and at a few which have specifically requested the Air Force program during their normal summer programs. In view of these facts the total amount requested will not be required and the Air Force suggested a reduction of \$5,557,000 leaving a total requirement of \$17,543,000.

AIR NATIONAL GUARD

The mission of the Air National Guard is to furnish units trained and equipped as an operational force available for immediate utilization in the air defense of the United States. With the advent of the Korean situation the Air National Guard was called upon to provide 4 aviation engineer battalions of 12 companies and 5 tactical groups consisting of 15 tactical squadrons. The Guard was then reorganized into a structure similar to that of the regular Air Force making it readily adaptable in the mobilization of other Air National Guard units. It was then called upon for 17 wings and 51 squadrons plus

supporting elements into the active Federal service. The remaining 5 wings and 18 squadrons plus the supporting units that remained will comprise the Air National Guard program for fiscal year 1952. To meet the requirements of the Air National Guard \$87,900,000 is requested and is broken down as shown on page 667 of the hearings.

CONTINGENCIES

The appropriation request for contingencies for which \$40,600,000 is to provide for emergency expenses to be expended on the authority or approval of the Secretary of the Air Force and such expenses may be accounted for solely on his certificate.

LANGUAGE CHANGES, AIR FORCE

Under the heading "Military Personnel Requirements", previous language making specific reference to travel and travel allowances of various kinds has been deleted on the basis that the same authority is now provided by section 303 of the Career Compensation Act.

Under the heading "Aircraft and Related Procurement", former language covering electronic and communication equipment has been deleted. The items are now budgeted for under the appropriation "Major Procurement other than Aircraft".

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Changes in the general provisions are comparatively minor, and for the most part are made only to correspond to changes made in basic law. In line with the usual policy of the Committee, no new legislative provisions have been inserted. Explanation of the principal changes follows:

The wording of section 604, which prohibits the use of military pay and allowance appropriations for other purposes, has been slightly revised so that it will permit the transfer of Army pay funds to a new appropriation structure. However, the ban on using such funds for other purposes remains in effect under the revised wording.

Section 611, pertaining to the use of appropriations for patents and copyrights, has been revised by providing for the purchase of designs, processes and manufacturing data. Clear authority to acquire special manufacturing processes and "know-how" should result in increased efficiency and economy in the manufacture and procurement of military equipment.

The wording of section 620, covering the rate of commutation of rations to enlisted personnel on leave or messing separately, has been clarified so as to leave no doubt that such enlisted personnel should receive an amount equivalent to the cost of the ration. This rate of reimbursement is normally prescribed annually by the Secretary of Defense.

Section 626 permits the President whenever he deems such action necessary in the interest of national defense to exempt military functions appropriations from the process of apportionment by the Bureau of the Budget. The former provisions automatically exempted all military functions appropriations from such apportionment. The proposed language makes the exemption discretionary rather than automatic.

The wording of section 108 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951, and of sections 703, 704, 705 and 706 of the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951, has not been repeated in this bill, since such provisions are permanent in effect.

Section 628. This is a new section for the purpose of requiring commissary sales prices to include all direct costs of maintenance, operation, management, etc., except overseas transportation. It reads as follows:

SEC. 628. No appropriation contained in this Act shall be available for any direct expense (including commercial transportation in the United States to the place of sale but excluding all transportation outside the United States) in connection with the maintenance, conduct, operation, or management of sales commissaries, or commissary stores, of agencies of the Department of Defense, except where reimbursement for such expenses is to be made, in accordance with regulations approved by the Secretary of Defense, to the appropriations concerned from the proceeds of sales therein: Provided, That hereafter the proviso under the head "Subsistence of the Army," in the Army Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1885, shall not apply to sales by sales commissaries or commissary stores and such sales shall not be made at prices insufficient to cover the direct expenses of said activities and the cost of articles sold: Provided further, That, under unusual or extraordinary circumstances, the cost of pay and allowances of military personnel may, in the discretion of the Secretary of Defense, be excluded from the reimbursements required under this section. (Defense Appropriation Act, 1951; Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951; Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951.)

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1951, ESTIMATES FOR 1952, AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 1952—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

TITLE I—INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

Item	Appropriations, 1951 (adjusted)	Budget estimates, 1952	Recommended in bill for 1952	Bill compared with—	
				1951 appropriations	1952 estimates
NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL					
Salaries and expenses-----	\$160, 000	\$160, 000	\$160, 000	-----	-----
NATIONAL SECURITY RESOURCES BOARD					
Salaries and expenses-----	3, 500, 000	1, 600, 000	1, 600, 000	\$1, 900, 000	-----
Total, title I—Independent Agencies-----	3, 660, 000	1, 760, 000	1, 760, 000	—1, 900, 000	-----

TITLE II—OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE					
Salaries and expenses-----	\$12, 300, 000	\$14, 800, 000	\$13, 800, 000	+\$1, 500, 000	—\$1, 000, 000
Claims-----	5, 000, 000	5, 000, 000	5, 000, 000	-----	-----
Retired pay-----	342, 000, 000	360, 000, 000	345, 000, 000	+3, 000, 000	—15, 000, 000
Contingencies-----	85, 000, 000	75, 000, 000	75, 000, 000	—10, 000, 000	-----
Emergency fund-----	240, 000, 000	90, 000, 000	90, 000, 000	—150, 000, 000	-----
Total, title II—Office of the Secretary of Defense-----	684, 300, 000	544, 800, 000	528, 800, 000	—155, 500, 000	—16, 000, 000

TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF THE ARMY					
Contingencies of the Army-----	\$80, 978, 000	\$88, 055, 000	\$88, 000, 000	+ \$7, 022, 000	—\$55, 000
Civilian relief in Korea-----	50, 000, 000	50, 000, 000	50, 000, 000	-----	-----
Expediting production-----	1, 100, 000, 000	1, 100, 000, 000	1, 000, 000, 000	—100, 000, 000	—100, 000, 000
National Board for Promotion of Rifle Practice-----	160, 000	130, 000	130, 000	—30, 000	-----
Total, Office of the Secretary of Army-----	1, 231, 138, 000	1, 238, 185, 000	1, 138, 130, 000	—93, 008, 000	—100, 055, 000
GENERAL STAFF CORPS					
Special field exercises-----	5, 350, 000	16, 000, 000	16, 000, 000	+10, 650, 000	-----
Inter-American relations-----	432, 000	388, 000	388, 000	—44, 000	-----
Total, General Staff Corps-----	5, 782, 000	16, 388, 000	16, 388, 000	+10, 606, 000	-----
FINANCE CORPS					
Pay of the Army-----	2, 443, 100, 000	3, 308, 425, 000	3, 297, 076, 000	+853, 976, 000	—11, 349, 000
Travel of the Army-----	177, 000, 000	254, 000, 000	245, 000, 000	+68, 000, 000	—9, 000, 000
Finance service employees-----	40, 030, 000	48, 423, 000	48, 423, 000	+8, 393, 000	-----
Total, Finance Department-----	2, 660, 130, 000	3, 610, 848, 000	3, 590, 499, 000	+930, 369, 000	—20, 349, 000

¹ Original estimate of \$4,000,000 reduced \$2,400,000 in H. Doc. No. 194.

*Comparative statement of appropriations for 1951, estimates for 1952, and amounts recommended in the bill for 1952—
Department of Defense appropriation bill, 1952—Continued*

TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY—Continued

Item	Appropriations, 1951 (adjusted)	Budget estimates, 1952	Recommended in bill for 1952	Bill compared with—	
				1951 appropriations	1952 estimates
QUARTERMASTER CORPS					
Welfare of enlisted men-----	\$18, 926, 500	\$20, 000, 000	\$20, 000, 000	+\$1, 073, 500	-----
Subsistence of the Army-----	912, 293, 000	603, 309, 000	603, 309, 000	—308, 984, 000	-----
Regular supplies of the Army-----	489, 108, 258	485, 351, 000	465, 000, 000	—24, 108, 258	—\$20, 351, 000
Clothing and equipage-----	1, 697, 367, 365	^a 1, 647, 681, 000	1, 506, 681, 000	—190, 686, 365	—141, 000, 000
Incidental expenses of the Army-----	172, 235, 313	198, 914, 000	187, 914, 000	+15, 678, 687	—11, 000, 000
Total, Quartermaster Corps-----	3, 289, 930, 436	2, 955, 255, 000	2, 782, 904, 000	—507, 026, 436	—172, 351, 000
TRANSPORTATION CORPS					
Transportation service, Army-----	1, 076, 963, 000	978, 515, 000	968, 515, 000	—108, 448, 000	—10, 000, 000
SIGNAL CORPS					
Signal service of the Army-----	1, 147, 331, 000	1, 243, 707, 000	1, 213, 707, 000	+66, 376, 000	—30, 000, 000
Alaska communication system:					
Operation and maintenance-----	4, 187, 000	4, 176, 000	4, 176, 000	—11, 000	-----
Construction-----	1, 140, 000	1, 400, 000	1, 400, 000	+260, 000	-----
Total, Signal Corps-----	1, 152, 658, 000	1, 249, 283, 000	1, 219, 283, 000	+66, 625, 000	—30, 000, 000

MEDICAL SERVICE					
Medical and Hospital Department-----	174, 563, 000	272, 059, 000	269, 580, 000	+95, 017, 000	-2, 479, 000
CORPS OF ENGINEERS					
Engineer service-----	1, 538, 154, 500	1, 201, 049, 000	1, 166, 049, 000	-372, 105, 500	-35, 000, 000
Military construction-----	499, 970, 585	48, 363, 700	48, 363, 700	-451, 606, 885	-----
Total, Corps of Engineers-----	2, 038, 125, 085	1, 249, 412, 700	1, 214, 412, 700	-823, 712, 385	-35, 000, 000
ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT					
Ordnance service and supplies-----	6, 987, 636, 000	8, 616, 011, 000	8, 307, 500, 000	+1, 319, 864, 000	-308, 511, 000
CHEMICAL CORPS					
Chemical service-----	120, 253, 000	122, 560, 000	122, 560, 000	+2, 307, 000	-----
ARMY TRAINING					
Army training-----	14, 097, 000	22, 500, 000	22, 300, 000	+8, 203, 000	-200, 000
UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY					
Maintenance and operation-----	5, 385, 000	6, 305, 000	6, 305, 000	+920, 000	-----
CIVILIAN COMPONENTS					
Army National Guard-----	256, 248, 000	203, 002, 000	202, 982, 000	-53, 266, 000	-20, 000
Organized Reserves-----	131, 931, 000	106, 536, 000	104, 810, 000	-27, 121, 000	-1, 726, 000
Army Reserve Officers' Training Corps-----	33, 900, 000	27, 236, 000	27, 141, 000	-6, 759, 000	-95, 000
Military construction-----	-----	24, 000, 000	24, 000, 000	+24, 000, 000	-----
Total, civilian components-----	422, 079, 000	360, 774, 000	358, 933, 000	-63, 146, 000	-1, 841, 000

² Includes \$1,130,000 for stockpiling.

*Comparative statement of appropriations for 1951, estimates for 1952, and amounts recommended in the bill for 1952—
Department of Defense appropriation bill, 1952—Continued*

TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY—Continued

Item	Appropriations, 1951 (adjusted)	Budget estimates, 1952	Recommended in bill for 1952	Bill compared with—	
				1951 appropriations	1952 estimates
SALARIES					
Secretary of the Army-----	\$3, 531, 408	\$3, 723, 400	\$3, 625, 000	+\$93, 592	—\$98, 400
Chief of Staff-----	7, 969, 166	10, 550, 500	9, 500, 000	+ 1, 530, 834	— 1, 050, 500
Adjutant General's Office-----	13, 842, 059	17, 473, 200	16, 500, 000	+ 2, 657, 941	—973, 200
Inspector General-----	224, 182	259, 000	259, 000	+34, 818	-----
Judge Advocate General-----	668, 212	761, 000	700, 000	+31, 788	— 61, 000
Chief of Finance-----	1, 655, 306	1, 540, 500	1, 540, 500	—114, 806	-----
Quartermaster General-----	8, 997, 860	10, 125, 600	9, 625, 000	+627, 140	—500, 600
Chief of Transportation-----	3, 459, 373	4, 024, 300	3, 800, 000	+340, 627	—224, 300
Chief Signal Officer-----	3, 151, 840	3, 871, 700	3, 750, 000	+598, 160	— 121, 700
Chief of Special Services-----	58, 636	(³)	-----	—58, 636	-----
Provost Marshal General-----	175, 176	245, 000	245, 000	+69, 824	-----
Surgeon General-----	2, 916, 882	3, 227, 600	3, 100, 000	+ 183, 118	— 127, 600
Chief of Engineers-----	4, 516, 319	5, 637, 600	5, 400, 000	+883, 681	—237, 600
Chief of Ordnance-----	5, 455, 516	6, 867, 000	6, 500, 000	+ 1, 044, 484	—367, 000

Chief of Chemical Corps-----	1, 111, 957	1, 523, 600	1, 500, 000	+ 388, 043	-23, 600
Chief of Chaplains-----	147, 730	170, 000	170, 000	+ 22, 270	-----
Total, salaries-----	57, 881, 622	70, 000, 000	66, 214, 500	+ 8, 332, 878	-3, 785, 500
Contingent expenses-----	27, 531, 000	30, 750, 000	30, 000, 000	+ 2, 469, 000	-750, 000
Total, title III—Department of the Army, general-----	19, 264, 152, 143	20, 798, 845, 700	20, 113, 524, 200	+ 849, 372, 057	-685, 321, 500
Special accounts:					
Secretary of the Army:					
Replacement of personal property sold-----	1, 785, 757	1, 250, 300	1, 250, 300	-535, 457	-----
Preparation for sale or salvage of military property-----	10, 000, 000	10, 000, 000	10, 000, 000	-----	-----
Total, Secretary of the Army-----	11, 785, 757	11, 250, 300	11, 250, 300	-535, 457	-----
Corps of Engineers: Defense production guaranties-----	50, 000	800, 000	800, 000	+ 750, 000	-----
Finance Department: Expenses and losses, financing war contracts-----	1, 806	165	165	-1, 641	-----
Total, special accounts, Department of the Army-----	11, 837, 563	12, 050, 465	12, 050, 465	+ 212, 902	-----
Total, title III, Department of the Army, general and special appropriations-----	19, 275, 989, 706	20, 810, 896, 165	20, 125, 574, 665	+ 849, 584, 959	-685, 321, 500

³ Activities transferred to the Adjutant General's Office.

*Comparative statement of appropriations for 1951, estimates for 1952, and amounts recommended in the bill for 1952—
Department of Defense appropriation bill, 1952—Continued*

TITLE IV—DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Item	Appropriations, 1951 (adjusted)	Budget estimates, 1952	Recommended in bill for 1952	Bill compared with—	
				1951 appropriations	1952 estimates
Military personnel:					
Navy-----	\$1, 825, 073, 000	\$2, 463, 365, 000	\$2, 456, 475, 000	+\$631, 402, 000	—\$6, 890, 000
Naval Reserve-----	57, 137, 000	62, 718, 000	62, 718, 000	+5, 581, 000	-----
Officer candidates-----	18, 899, 300	19, 807, 000	19, 348, 000	+448, 700	—459, 000
Navy personnel, general expenses-----	121, 850, 000	97, 970, 000	97, 570, 000	—24, 280, 000	—400, 000
Military personnel, Marine Corps-----	476, 158, 000	565, 459, 000	565, 459, 000	+89, 301, 000	-----
Military personnel, Marine Corps Reserve-----	7, 439, 000	15, 145, 000	15, 145, 000	+7, 706, 000	-----
Marine Corps, troops and facilities-----	611, 127, 000	1, 052, 970, 000	1, 018, 120, 000	+406, 993, 000	—34, 850, 000
Aircraft and facilities-----	902, 693, 000	925, 393, 000	923, 393, 000	+20, 700, 000	—2, 000, 000
Construction of aircraft and related pro- curement-----	2, 880, 629, 000	^a 4, 022, 476, 000	4, 000, 000, 000	+1, 119, 371, 000	—22, 476, 000
Ships and facilities-----	1, 553, 978, 000	^b 1, 605, 424, 000	1, 537, 452, 000	—16, 526, 000	—67, 972, 000
Construction of ships-----	747, 200, 000	77, 353, 000	77, 353, 000	—669, 847, 000	-----
Shipbuilding and conversion-----	-----	1, 343, 297, 000	1, 343, 297, 000	+1, 343, 297, 000	-----
Ordnance and facilities-----	1, 440, 451, 000	^c 1, 347, 668, 000	1, 335, 668, 000	—104, 783, 000	—12, 000, 000

Ordnance for new construction-----	105,800,000	52,445,000	52,445,000	-53,355,000	-----
Ordnance for shipbuilding and conversion--		431,390,000	431,390,000	+431,390,000	-----
Increase and replacement of naval vessels: Construction and machinery-----	83,800,000	45,000,000	45,000,000	-38,800,000	-----
Armor, armament, and ammunition-----	47,400,000	12,656,000	12,656,000	-34,744,000	-----
Medical care-----	127,138,000	136,545,000	135,770,000	+8,632,000	-775,000
Civil engineering-----	154,457,000	203,488,000	196,488,000	+42,031,000	-7,000,000
Public works (new)-----	469,784,000	50,414,000	50,414,000	-419,370,000	-----
Research-----	75,168,000	69,698,000	69,698,000	-5,470,000	-----
Service-wide supply and finance-----	412,290,000	497,602,000	485,102,000	+72,812,000	-12,500,000
Service-wide operations-----	183,478,000	152,729,000	150,779,000	-32,699,000	-1,950,000
Island governments-----	2,125,000			-2,125,000	-----
Operation and conservation of naval petroleum reserves-----	4,000,000	11,908,000	11,908,000	+7,908,000	-----
Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4, Alaska-----	11,000,000			-11,000,000	-----
Navy stock fund-----	143,000,000	475,000,000	450,000,000	+307,000,000	-25,000,000
Total, title IV—Department of the Navy, general-----	12,462,074,300	15,737,920,000	15,543,648,000	+3,081,573,700	-194,272,000

¹ Includes \$23,000,000 to be transferred to "Facilities."² Includes \$21,145,000 to be transferred to "Facilities."³ Includes \$38,510,000 to be transferred to "Facilities."

*Comparative statement of appropriations for 1951, estimates for 1952, and amounts recommended in the bill for 1952—
Department of Defense appropriation bill, 1952—Continued*

TITLE IV—DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY—Continued

Item	Appropriations, 1951 (adjusted)	Budget estimates, 1952	Recommended in bill for 1952	Bill compared with—	
				1951 appropriations	1952 estimates
Special accounts, Department of the Navy:					
Preparation for sale or salvage of military property-----	\$1,792,500	\$4,000,000	\$4,000,000	+\$2,207,500	-----
Defense production guaranties-----	400,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	+1,600,000	-----
Laundry service, Naval Academy-----	415,241	445,225	445,225	+29,984	-----
Preservation, cataloging, etc. of stocks-----	4,597,155	-----	-----	-4,597,155	-----
Replacement of personal property sold-----	3,700,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	-1,700,000	-----
Preservation of frigate <i>Constellation</i> -----	-----	50,000	50,000	+50,000	-----
Total, special account, Department of the Navy-----	10,904,896	8,495,225	8,495,225	-2,409,671	-----
Total, title IV—General and special accounts, Department of the Navy-----	12,472,979,196	15,746,415,225	15,552,143,225	+3,079,164,029	-\$194,272,000

TITLE V—DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

Aircraft and related procurement-----	\$7,292,000,000	\$11,717,000,000	\$11,215,800,000	+\$3,923,800,000	—\$501,200,000
Major procurement other than aircraft----	1,610,007,000	1,800,000,000	1,750,000,000	+139,993,000	—50,000,000
Acquisition and construction of real property-----	1,448,148,000	85,000,000	85,000,000	—1,363,148,000	-----
Maintenance and operations-----	3,024,218,000	3,238,700,000	3,208,442,000	+184,224,000	—30,258,000
Military personnel requirement-----	1,935,500,000	3,076,700,000	3,016,700,000	+1,081,200,000	—60,000,000
Research and development-----	297,611,000	425,000,000	425,000,000	+127,389,000	-----
Reserve personnel requirements-----	39,818,000	23,100,000	17,543,000	—22,275,000	—5,557,000
Air National Guard-----	103,935,000	87,900,000	87,900,000	—16,035,000	-----
Contingencies-----	39,824,000	40,600,000	40,600,000	+776,000	-----
Total, title V—Department of the Air Force, general-----	15,791,061,000	20,494,000,000	19,846,985,000	+4,055,924,000	—647,015,000
Special accounts:					
Defense production guaranties-----	30,000	135,000	135,000	+105,000	-----
Preparation for sale or salvage of military property-----	4,900,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	—1,900,000	-----
Replacement of personal property sold-----	6,395,022	4,000,000	4,000,000	—2,395,022	-----

*Comparative statement of appropriations for 1951, estimates for 1952, and amounts recommended in the bill for 1952—
Department of Defense appropriation bill, 1952—Continued*

TITLE V—DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE—Continued

Item	Appropriations, 1951 (adjusted)	Budget estimates, 1952	Recommended in bill for 1952	Bill compared with—	
				1951 appropriations	1952 estimates
Special accounts—Continued					
Wildlife conservation, etc., Eglin Field Reservation-----	\$8, 000	\$8, 000	\$8, 000		
Total, Department of the Air Force, special account-----	11, 333, 022	7, 143, 000	7, 143, 000	—\$4, 190, 022	
Total, title V Department of the Air Force, general and special accounts-----	15, 802, 394, 022	20, 501, 143, 000	19, 854, 128, 000	+4, 051, 733, 978	—\$647, 015, 000
Total, regular annual appropria- tions, titles I, II, III, IV, V----	48, 205, 247, 443	57, 577, 325, 700	56, 034, 717, 200	+7, 829, 469, 757	—1, 542, 608, 500
Total, general and special appro- priations, titles I, II, III, IV, V-	48, 239, 322, 924	57, 605, 014, 390	56, 062, 405, 890	+7, 823, 082, 966	—1, 542, 608, 500

INDEX

	A	Page
Air Force, Department of the	-----	124
Aircraft and related procurement	-----	125
Contingencies	-----	145
Language changes	-----	145, 146
Maintenance and operations	-----	135
Major procurement other than aircraft	-----	130
Military personnel requirements	-----	142
National Guard	-----	145
Research and development	-----	144
Reserve personnel requirements	-----	144
Army, Department of the	-----	7
Alaskan Communication System	-----	24
Construction	-----	25
Chemical Service	-----	37
Civilian personnel	-----	8
Clothing and equipage	-----	15
Contingencies of the Army	-----	8
Departmental salaries and expenses	-----	43
Engineer service	-----	29
Expediting production	-----	9
Field exercises	-----	9
Finance service	-----	10
Incidental expenses of the Army	-----	16
Language changes	-----	44, 146
Medical and Hospital Department	-----	25
Military construction	-----	33
Civilian components	-----	41
National Guard	-----	39
Ordnance service and supplies	-----	33
Organized Reserve Corps	-----	40
Regular supplies of the Army	-----	13
Reserve Officers' Training Corps	-----	40
Research and development	-----	41
Medical and Hospital Department	-----	42
Quartermaster Service	-----	43
Transportation Service	-----	42
Signal Service of the Army	-----	21
Subsistence of the Army	-----	12
Training	-----	38
Transportation Service	-----	18
United States Military Academy, operation and maintenance	-----	38
Welfare of enlisted men	-----	11

	G	Page
General provisions	-----	146

	Page
N	
Navy, Department of.....	45
Aircraft:	
Aircraft and facilities.....	62
Construction and related procurement.....	66
Civil engineering.....	95
Civilian personnel.....	45
Increase and replacement of naval vessels, armor, armament, and ammunition.....	89
Language changes.....	123, 146
Marine Corps:	
Military personnel.....	56
Reserve, military personnel.....	57
Troops and facilities.....	58
Medical care.....	90
Military personnel:	
Naval Reserve.....	49
Navy.....	46
Officer candidates.....	50
Naval petroleum reserves, operation and conservation of.....	122
Navy personnel, general expenses.....	51
Navy stock fund.....	116
Ordnance:	
New construction.....	88
Ordnance and facilities.....	79
Shipbuilding and conversion.....	89
Public works.....	103
Research.....	103
Service-wide operations.....	116
Service-wide supply and finance.....	107
Ships:	
Construction.....	78
Increase and replacement of naval vessels, construction and machinery.....	79
Shipbuilding and conversion.....	79
Ships and facilities.....	68
S	
Secretary of Defense, Office of the.....	6

Union Calendar No. 246

82^d CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 5054

[Report No. 790]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

AUGUST 6, 1951

Mr. MAHON, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the following bill; which was committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

A BILL

Making appropriations for the National Security Council, the National Security Resources Board, and for military functions administered by the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money
4 in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the National
5 Security Council, the National Security Resources Board,

1 and for military functions administered by the Department
2 of Defense, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending
3 June 30, 1952, namely:

4 TITLE I

5 NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

6 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
7 National Security Council, including services as authorized
8 by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C.
9 55a), at rates not in excess of \$50 per diem for individuals;
10 acceptance and utilization of voluntary and uncompensated
11 services; and expenses of attendance at meetings con-
12 cerned with work related to the activity of the Council;
13 \$160,000.

14 NATIONAL SECURITY RESOURCES BOARD

15 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
16 National Security Resources Board; services as authorized
17 by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C.
18 55a), at rates for individuals not in excess of \$50 per diem
19 and contracts with temporary or part-time employees may be
20 renewed annually; expenses of attendance at meetings of
21 organizations concerned with the work of the National
22 Security Resources Board; hire of passenger motor vehicles;
23 reimbursement of the General Services Administration for
24 security guard services for protection of confidential files;
25 not to exceed \$8,000 for newspapers and periodicals; and

1 not to exceed \$10,000 for emergency and extraordinary
2 expenses, to be expended under the direction of the Chairman
3 for such purposes as he deems proper, and his determination
4 thereon shall be final and conclusive; \$1,600,000.

5 DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

6 MILITARY FUNCTIONS

7 TITLE II

8 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

9 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

10 For expenses necessary for the Office of the Secretary
11 of Defense, the Armed Forces Policy Council, the Joint
12 Chiefs of Staff and the Joint Staff, the Munitions Board, and
13 the Research and Development Board, including purchase
14 (not to exceed five for replacement only, including one at not
15 to exceed \$4,500) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; and
16 not to exceed \$60,000 for emergency and extraordinary ex-
17 penses, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of
18 Defense for such purposes as he deems proper, and his deter-
19 mination thereon shall be final and conclusive; \$13,800,000.

20 CLAIMS

21 For payment of claims by the Office of the Secretary
22 of Defense, the Army (except as provided in appropriations
23 for civil functions administered by the Department of the
24 Army), Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force, as authorized
25 by law (5 U. S. C. 946; 28 U. S. C. 2672; 31 U. S. C.

1 222c, 222e, 223b, 223d, 224d; 34 U. S. C. 600; 35 U. S. C.
2 91; 39 U. S. C. 135; 46 U. S. C. 797; Act of November
3 15, 1945, 59 Stat. 582) ; claims (not to exceed \$1,000
4 in any one case) for damages to or loss of private property
5 incident to the operation of Army and Air National Guard
6 camps of instruction, either during the stay of units of said
7 organizations at such camps or while en route thereto or
8 therefrom; claims, as authorized by law, for damage to
9 property of railroads under training contracts; and repay-
10 ment of amounts determined by the Secretary of the Army,
11 the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air
12 Force, or officers designated by them, to have been erro-
13 neously collected from military and civilian personnel of the
14 Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force or from
15 States, Territories, or the District of Columbia, or members
16 of National Guard units thereof; \$5,000,000.

17 **RETIRED PAY**

18 For retired pay and retirement pay, as authorized by law,
19 of military personnel on the retired lists of the Army, Navy,
20 Marine Corps, and the Air Force, including the reserve
21 components thereof; and retainer pay for personnel of the
22 inactive Fleet Reserve; \$345,000.000.

23 **CONTINGENCIES**

24 For emergencies and extraordinary expenses arising in
25 the Department of Defense, to be expended on the approval

1 or authority of the Secretary of Defense and such expenses
2 may be accounted for solely on his certificate that the ex-
3 penditures were necessary for confidential military purposes,
4 \$75,000,000: *Provided*, That a report of disbursements
5 under this item of appropriation shall be made quarterly
6 to the Appropriation Committees of the Congress.

7 EMERGENCY FUND

8 For transfer by the Secretary of Defense, with the ap-
9 proval of the Bureau of the Budget, to any appropriation
10 for military functions under the Department of Defense
11 available for research and development, to be merged with
12 and to be available for the same purposes, and for the same
13 time period, as the appropriation to which transferred,
14 \$90,000,000.

15 DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

16 TITLE III

17 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF THE ARMY

18 CONTINGENCIES OF THE ARMY

19 For emergencies and military expenses arising in
20 the Department of the Army or any of its subordinate
21 bureaus or offices in the District of Columbia, or in the
22 Army at large, but impossible to be anticipated or classified,
23 including personal services; the actual and necessary ex-
24 penses or per diem in lieu thereof, as may be determined
25 and approved by the Secretary of the Army, of military

1 and civilian personnel in and under the Department
2 of the Army on special duty in foreign countries;
3 to be expended on the approval or authority of
4 the Secretary of the Army, and for such purposes
5 as he may deem proper, and his determination thereon
6 shall be final and conclusive upon the accounting officers
7 of the Government and payments from this appropriation
8 may, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Army, be
9 made on his certificate that the expenditures were necessary
10 for confidential military purposes; \$88,000,000.

11 CIVILIAN RELIEF IN KOREA

12 For an additional amount for "Civilian relief in Korea,"
13 \$50,000,000.

14 EXPEDITING PRODUCTION

15 To enable the Secretary of the Army, without reference
16 to section 3734 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and to
17 section 1136 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (except
18 provisions thereof relating to title approval), to expedite
19 the production of equipment and supplies for the Army for
20 emergency national defense purposes, including all of the
21 objects and purposes specified under each of the appropria-
22 tions available to the Department of the Army during the
23 current fiscal year, for procurement or production of
24 equipment or supplies, for erection of structures, or for
25 acquisition of land; the furnishing of Government-owned

1 facilities at privately owned plants; the procurement and
 2 training of civilian personnel in connection with the pro-
 3 duction of equipment and material and the use and operation
 4 thereof; and for any other purposes which in the discretion
 5 of the Secretary of the Army are desirable in expediting
 6 production for military purposes, \$1,000,000,000.

7 NATIONAL BOARD FOR PROMOTION OF RIFLE PRACTICE,
 8 ARMY

9 For necessary expenses of construction, equipment, and
 10 maintenance of rifle ranges, the instruction of citizens in
 11 marksmanship, and promotion of rifle practice, in accord-
 12 ance with the Act of August 29, 1916 (39 Stat. 643),
 13 and the provisions of law contained in 10 U. S. C. 1184-
 14 1185 and 32 U. S. C. 181-186, including travel of rifle
 15 teams, military personnel and individuals attending regional,
 16 national, and international competitions, and not to exceed
 17 \$18,000 for incidental expenses of the National Board,
 18 \$130,000: *Provided*, That travel expenses of civilian mem-
 19 bers of the National Board shall be paid in accordance with
 20 the Standardized Government Travel Regulations, as
 21 amended.

22 GENERAL STAFF

23 FIELD EXERCISES

24 For expenses, not otherwise provided for, required for
 25 the conduct of special field exercises, including participation

1 therein by the National Guard and the Organized Reserves,
2 and including personal services of temporary employees,
3 expenses of troop movements and temporary duty travel of
4 military and civilian personnel, in connection with special
5 field exercises, including special combat training for small
6 units, movement of matériel, maintenance and operation of
7 structures and utilities, rental of land or purchase of options
8 to rent land without reference to section 3648, Revised
9 Statutes, and for use or repair of private property,
10 \$16,000,000.

11 INTER-AMERICAN RELATIONS, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

12 For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary of the
13 Army to adopt such measures, appropriate to the functions
14 and activities of the Department of the Army, as he may
15 deem advisable, to promote better relations with the other
16 American countries, including transportation and subsistence
17 expenses, while traveling in the Western Hemisphere, of
18 Army officers and military students of the other American
19 countries and Army officers of the United States, \$388,000.

20 FINANCE CORPS

21 FINANCE SERVICE, ARMY

22 For Finance Service, Army, to be accounted for as one
23 fund, as follows—

PAY OF THE ARMY

1
2 For pay and allowances (except commuted rations for
3 enlisted personnel) of cadets and all other personnel of the
4 Army of the United States on active duty (other than
5 personnel of the Reserve components, including the National
6 Guard, on active duty while undergoing Reserve training) ;
7 pay of civilian employees at military headquarters; interest
8 on soldiers' deposits; payment of life insurance premiums
9 authorized by law; mustering-out payments, as authorized by
10 the "Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944", as amended
11 (38 U. S. C. 691-691g), to persons who were or may be
12 denied such payments because they were discharged from
13 the Army to enter the United States Military Academy or
14 the United States Naval Academy and subsequently were
15 discharged from either Academy because of physical dis-
16 ability; expenses of military courts, boards and commissions;
17 expenses of apprehension and delivery of deserters, escaped
18 military prisoners, and soldiers absent without leave, in-
19 cluding payment of rewards, in the discretion of the Secre-
20 tary of the Army, not exceeding \$25 in any one case, to
21 civil officers and citizens, costs of confinement of military
22 prisoners in nonmilitary facilities, donations of not to exceed

1 \$25 to each civilian prisoner upon each release from an Army
2 prison and each soldier discharged otherwise than honorably
3 upon each release from confinement under court-martial sen-
4 tence, and donations of not to exceed \$10, as authorized by
5 law, to each person discharged for fraudulent enlistment;
6 \$3,297,076,000: *Provided*, That section 212 of the Act of
7 June 30, 1932 (5 U. S. C. 59a), shall not apply to retired
8 military personnel on duty at the United States Soldiers'
9 Home: *Provided further*, That the duties of librarian at the
10 United States Military Academy may be performed by an
11 officer of the Regular Army retired from active service, and
12 detailed on active duty for that purpose;

13 TRAVEL OF THE ARMY

14 For travel allowances and travel in kind, as authorized
15 by law, for persons traveling in connection with the military
16 activities of the Department of the Army, including rental
17 of camp sites and the local procurement of communication
18 service, fuel, light, water service, and other necessary
19 supplies and services incident to individual or troop move-
20 ments, including transportation of organizational equipment
21 and impedimenta; and for expenses, not otherwise provided
22 for, incident to the transportation of authorized baggage of
23 military and civilian personnel; \$245,000,000: *Provided*,
24 That other appropriations for the Department of the Army
25 shall be charged with such amounts as may be required for

1 travel in connection with development, procurement, produc-
2 tion, maintenance, or construction activities; and, with such
3 exception, no other Army appropriation in this Act shall be
4 available for any expense for or incident to travel of personnel
5 of the Regular Army or civilian employees under the Depart-
6 ment of the Army, except the appropriation "Contingencies
7 of the Army" and the appropriations for Engineer Service,
8 Army, the Army National Guard, the Organized Reserves,
9 the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, the National Board for
10 the Promotion of Rifle Practice, and the appropriations
11 "Special Field Exercises", and "Inter-American Relations,
12 Department of the Army";

13 FINANCE SERVICE

14 For compensation of field personnel of the Finance
15 Corps, and services incident to financial management activi-
16 ties not otherwise provided for; payment of exchange fees
17 and exchange losses incurred by disbursing officers or their
18 agents; and losses in the accounts of Army disbursing officers
19 in accordance with the Acts of December 13, 1944 (31
20 U. S. C. 95a), December 23, 1944 (50 U. S. C. 1705-
21 1707), and July 26, 1947 (61 Stat. 493); \$48,423,000.

22 QUARTERMASTER CORPS

23 QUARTERMASTER SERVICE, ARMY

24 For Quartermaster Service, Army, to be accounted for
25 as one fund, as follows—

1 WELFARE OF ENLISTED MEN

2 For the equipment and conduct of school, reading, lunch,
3 and amusement rooms, service clubs, chapels, gymnasiums,
4 and libraries, including periodicals and other publications
5 and subscriptions for newspapers, transportation of books
6 and equipment for these services, rental of films, purchase
7 of slides for and making repairs to moving-picture outfits,
8 and for similar and other recreational purposes at training
9 and mobilization camps now established or which may be
10 hereafter established, including expenses for the entertain-
11 ment and instruction of enlisted personnel, \$20,000,000:
12 *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for the
13 instruction of officers on the same basis as enlisted men.

14 SUBSISTENCE OF THE ARMY

15 For purchase of subsistence supplies for issue as rations
16 to troops, including retired enlisted men when ordered to
17 active duty, civil employees when entitled thereto, hospital
18 matrons, applicants for enlistment while held under obser-
19 vation, general prisoners of war, and general prisoners at
20 posts; ice for issue to organizations of enlisted men and for
21 cooling drinking water and for preservation of stores; sub-
22 sistence of the masters, officers, crews, and employees of Army
23 vessels; meals for recruiting parties and applicants for enlist-
24 ment while under observation; sales to officers, including mem-
25 bers of the Officers' Reserve Corps while on active duty, and

1 enlisted men of the Army; payment of allowances of commu-
2 tation in lieu of rations to enlisted men as authorized by law;
3 commuted rations for enlisted men, applicants for enlistment
4 while held under observation, civilian employees who are
5 entitled to subsistence at public expense, and general
6 prisoners while sick in hospitals, to be paid to the surgeon in
7 charge; advertising; for subsistence of supernumeraries ne-
8 cessitated by emergent military circumstances; prizes to be
9 established by the Secretary of the Army for enlisted men
10 of the Army who graduate from the Army schools for bakers
11 and cooks; and for other necessary expenses incident to the
12 purchase, testing, care, preservation, issue, sale, and
13 accounting for subsistence supplies for the Army; in all,
14 \$603,309,000: *Provided*, That none of the funds appro-
15 priated in this title shall be used for the payment of
16 any subsidy on agricultural or other products: *Provided*
17 *further*, That no part of this or any other appropriation con-
18 tained in this Act shall be available for the procurement
19 of any article of food or clothing not grown or produced in
20 the United States or its possessions, except to the extent
21 that the Secretary of the Department concerned shall deter-
22 mine that a satisfactory quality and sufficient quantity of any
23 articles of food or clothing grown or produced in the United
24 States or its possessions cannot be procured as and when
25 needed at United States market prices and except procure-

1 ments by vessels in foreign waters and emergency procure-
2 ments or procurements of perishable foods by establishments
3 located outside the continental United States, except the
4 Territories of Hawaii and Alaska, for the personnel attached
5 thereto: *Provided further*, That nothing herein shall preclude
6 the procurement of foods manufactured or processed in the
7 United States or its possessions;

8 REGULAR SUPPLIES OF THE ARMY

9 For supplies, services, and other expenses, not otherwise
10 provided for, incident to the design, development, procure-
11 ment, manufacture, care, protection, alteration, repair, main-
12 tenance, installation, storage and issue of Quartermaster
13 Corps supplies, materials, and equipment (exclusive of fixed
14 installations in buildings otherwise provided for), including
15 petroleum and other products, market reports and personal
16 services; supplies and equipment for troops and general serv-
17 ice schools; operation of field printing plants not otherwise
18 provided for and contract printing and binding; purchase,
19 subsistence, and care of animals required in connection with
20 Army training and other activities; expenses incident to
21 raising and harvesting forage on military reservations, in-
22 cluding, when specifically authorized by the Secretary of
23 the Army, the cost of irrigation; \$465,000,000;

CLOTHING AND EQUIPAGE

For cloth, woolens, materials, and for the purchase and manufacture of clothing for the Army, including retired enlisted men when ordered to active duty, for issue and for sale; commutation of clothing due enlisted men; altering and fitting clothing and washing and cleaning when necessary, including laundry work for enlisted men while patients in a hospital; operation of laundries, existing or now under construction, including purchase and repair of laundry machinery therefor; authorized issues of articles for use of general prisoners confined at military posts without pay or allowances, and for applicants for enlistment while held under observation; equipment and repair of equipment of existing dry-cleaning plants, salvage and sorting storehouses, hat-repairing shops, shoe-repair shops, clothing-repair shops, and garbage-reduction works; equipage; issue of toilet kits to recruits upon their first enlistment; expenses of packing and handling and similar necessities; citizens' outer clothing and an overcoat, when necessary, the cost of all not to exceed \$30, to be issued each person upon each release from an Army prison, each soldier discharged otherwise than honorably, to each enlisted man convicted by civil court for an offense resulting in confinement in a penitentiary

1 or other civil prison, and to each enlisted man ordered
2 interned as an alien enemy, or, for the same reason, dis-
3 charged without internment; \$1,506,681,000: *Provided*,
4 That none of the funds appropriated in this or any other
5 Act, and none of the property procured therewith, shall
6 be available for transfer to any working capital fund under
7 the provisions of section 405 (d) of the National Security
8 Act, as amended.

9 INCIDENTAL EXPENSES OF THE ARMY

10 Postage; incidental expenses of recruiting; for activi-
11 ties of chaplains (excluding ritual garments and personal
12 services); for tests and experimental and development
13 work and scientific research, not otherwise provided for,
14 including that to be performed by the Bureau of Standards
15 for the Quartermaster Corps; for inspection service and
16 instruction furnished by the Department of Agriculture
17 which may be transferred in advance; for such additional
18 expenditures as are necessary and authorized by law in the
19 movements and operation of the Army and at military posts,
20 and not expressly assigned to any other departments; for
21 burial of the dead as authorized by Acts of May 17, 1938
22 (10 U. S. C. 916-916d), and July 8, 1940 (5 U. S. C.
23 103a), including remains of personnel of the Army of the
24 United States who die while on active duty, including travel
25 allowances of attendants accompanying remains, communi-

1 cation service, transportation of remains, and acquisition by
2 lease or otherwise of temporary burial sites; \$187,914,000.

3 TRANSPORTATION CORPS

4 TRANSPORTATION SERVICE, ARMY

5 For expenses necessary for the transportation of Army
6 supplies, equipment, funds of the Army, including packing,
7 crating, and unpacking; maintenance and operation of trans-
8 portation facilities and installations, including the purchase,
9 construction, alteration, operation, lease, repair, development,
10 and maintenance of and research in transportation equipment,
11 including boats, vessels, and railroad equipment; procure-
12 ment of supplies and equipment; communication service;
13 maps, wharfage, tolls, ferriage, drayage, and cartage;
14 conducting instruction in Army transportation activities;
15 \$968,515,000: *Provided*, That during the current
16 fiscal year the cost of transportation from point of
17 origin to the first point of storage or consumption
18 of supplies, equipment, and material in connection with the
19 manufacturing and purchasing activities of the Quartermaster
20 Corps may be charged to the appropriations from which
21 such supplies, equipment, and material are procured: *Pro-*
22 *vided further*, That vessels under the jurisdiction of the
23 Department of Commerce, the Department of the Army,
24 the Department of the Air Force, or the Department of

1 the Navy may be transferred or otherwise made available
2 without reimbursement to any of such agencies upon the
3 request of the head of one agency and the approval of the
4 agency having jurisdiction of the vessels concerned.

5 SIGNAL CORPS

6 SIGNAL SERVICE OF THE ARMY

7 Purchase, equipment, operation, installation, and repair
8 of military telegraph, telephone, radio, cable, signaling, and
9 aircraft warning systems; signal equipment and stores,
10 heliographs, signal lanterns, flags, and other necessary in-
11 struments; wind vanes, barometers, anemometers, ther-
12 mometers, and other meteorological instruments; photo-
13 graphic and cinematographic work performed for the Army
14 by the Signal Corps; motor-driven and other vehicles for
15 technical and official purposes in connection with the con-
16 struction, operation, and maintenance of communication or
17 signaling systems, and supplies for their operation and main-
18 tenance; maps for use of the Signal Corps and in the office
19 of the Chief Signal Officer; telephone apparatus, including
20 rental and payment for commercial, exchange, message,
21 trunk-line, long-distance, and leased-line telephone service,
22 excepting telephone service for the various bureaus in the

1 District of Columbia, and the rental of commercial telegraph
2 lines and equipment, and their operation, at or connecting
3 any Army facility, including payment for official individual
4 telegraph messages transmitted over commercial lines; elec-
5 trical installations and maintenance thereof, electric time
6 service, fire control and direction apparatus, and matériel
7 for Field Artillery; supplies, general repairs, reserve
8 supplies, and other expenses connected with the col-
9 lection and transmitting of information for the Army
10 by telegraph or otherwise; experimental investigation,
11 research, purchase, and development, or improvements
12 in apparatus, and maintenance of signaling and acces-
13 sories thereto, including machines, instruments, and
14 other equipment for laboratory and repair purposes; lease,
15 alteration, and repair of such buildings required for storing
16 or guarding Signal Corps supplies, equipment, and personnel
17 when not otherwise provided for, including the introduction
18 of water, electric light and power, sewerage, grading, roads
19 and walks, and other equipment required; for all expenses,
20 not otherwise provided for, incident to the preparation of
21 plans, and construction, purchase, installation, equipment,
22 maintenance, repair, and operation of aircraft warning service

1 systems, and their accessories, including purchase of lands
2 and rights-of-way, acquisition of leaseholds and other interests
3 therein, and temporary use thereof; \$1,213,707,000.

4 ALASKA COMMUNICATION SYSTEM

5 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

6 For expenses necessary for the operation, maintenance,
7 and improvement of the Alaska Communication System, in-
8 cluding purchase (not to exceed one) and hire of passenger
9 motor vehicles, \$4,176,000, to remain available until the
10 close of the fiscal year 1953, and in addition not to exceed
11 15 per centum of the current fiscal year receipts of the
12 Alaska Communication System may be merged with and
13 used for the purposes of this appropriation.

14 CONSTRUCTION

15 For construction, installation, and equipment of tem-
16 porary or permanent public works, including buildings, facili-
17 ties, appurtenances and utilities, at stations of the Alaska
18 Communication System, as authorized by Act of October 27,
19 1949 (Public Law 414), without regard to sections 1136 and
20 3734, Revised Statutes, as amended, including hire of pas-
21 senger motor vehicles; \$1,400,000, to remain available
22 until expended: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall
23 not be available for construction of family quarters at (1)
24 an average cost in excess of \$24,000 for construction,
25 including but not limited to, kitchen range, refrigera-

1 tor, telephone, architectural and engineering services, and
2 all contingencies; nor at (2) a cost per family unit in excess
3 of \$5,000, for site development and outside utilities, including
4 architectural and engineering services therefor and all con-
5 tingencies.

6 MEDICAL SERVICE

7 MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL DEPARTMENT

8 For the manufacture and purchase of medical and hos-
9 pital supplies for military posts, camps, hospitals, hospital
10 ships and transports, and supplies required for mosquito
11 destruction in and about military posts in the Canal Zone;
12 operation of the Army Medical Library and Museum under
13 the direct supervision of the Surgeon General; purchase of
14 veterinary supplies and hire of veterinary surgeons; expenses
15 of medical supply depots and maintenance of branch depots;
16 medical care and treatment of patients when entitled thereto
17 by law, regulation, or contract, including their care, treat-
18 ment, and subsistence in private hospitals, whether on duty
19 or on furlough or on leave of absence except when elective
20 medical treatment has been obtained by such personnel in
21 civilian hospitals or from civilian physicians or dentists; medi-
22 cal care and treatment of authorized personnel of any country
23 whose defense the President deems vital to the defense of
24 the United States when such care and treatment cannot be
25 obtained from medical units of their own country; care and

1 treatment of epidemic and contagious diseases in the Army
 2 or at military posts or stations, including measures to prevent
 3 the spread thereof; pay of internes; pay of civilian physicians
 4 employed to examine physically applicants for enlistment
 5 and enlisted men and to render other professional services
 6 from time to time under proper authority; payment of ex-
 7 press companies and local transfers employed directly by the
 8 Medical Service for the transportation of medical and hos-
 9 pital supplies, including bidders' samples and water for
 10 analysis; supply of Army and Navy Hospital at Hot Springs,
 11 Arkansas; advertising, and other necessary miscellaneous
 12 expenses of the Medical Service, including tuition and fees
 13 of military and civilian personnel at civilian educational
 14 institutions; \$269,580,000.

15 CORPS OF ENGINEERS

16 ENGINEER SERVICE, ARMY

17 For expenses necessary for the procurement, manu-
 18 facture, maintenance, and issue of utilities, engineer sup-
 19 plies, materials, and equipment; procurement, preparation,
 20 and reproduction of maps and similar data for military
 21 purposes; military surveys, engineering planning, and in-
 22 vestigation and design; expenses incident to military and
 23 training operations, including operation of the Engineer
 24 School; travel and transportation; rentals, at the seat of
 25 Government or elsewhere, maintenance, installation, alter-

1 ation, repair, protection, and operation of buildings, grounds,
 2 and other facilities, including appurtenances thereto; ad-
 3 ministration of real estate, acquisition of lands, easements,
 4 rights-of-way, or other similar interests in and tempo-
 5 rary use of lands, and, in administering the provisions
 6 of 43 U. S. C. 315q, rentals may be paid in advance;
 7 payment of deficiency judgments and interest thereon arising
 8 out of condemnation proceedings; relocation of utilities not
 9 otherwise provided for; utility services for buildings erected
 10 at private cost, as authorized by law (10 U. S. C. 1346),
 11 and buildings on military reservations authorized by Depart-
 12 ment of the Army regulations to be used for a similar pur-
 13 pose; and expenses of packing, crating, unpacking, and
 14 uncrating of supplies, materials, equipment, and baggage
 15 not otherwise provided for; \$1,166,049,000.

16 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY

17 For an additional amount for "Military construction,
 18 Army," to remain available until expended, \$48,363,700,
 19 for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority
 20 heretofore granted under this head to enter into contracts.

21 ORDNANCE CORPS

22 ORDNANCE SERVICE AND SUPPLIES, ARMY

23 For manufacture, procurement, storage, and issue, in-
 24 cluding research, planning, design, development, inspection,
 25 test, alteration, maintenance, repair, and handling of ordnance

1 material and aircraft, together with the machinery, supplies,
2 and services necessary thereto; supplies and services in con-
3 nection with the general work of the Ordnance Corps, com-
4 prising police and office duties, rents, tolls, fuel, light, water,
5 advertising, stationery, typewriting and computing machines,
6 including their exchange, and furniture, tools, and instru-
7 ments of service; instruction, training, and other incidental
8 expenses of the ordnance service; purchase and hire of
9 passenger motor vehicles; ammunition for military salutes
10 at Government establishments and institutions to which the
11 issues of arms for salutes are authorized; services, material,
12 tools, and appliances for operation of the testing machines
13 and chemical laboratory in connection therewith; publica-
14 tions for libraries of the Ordnance Corps, including the
15 Ordnance Office; \$8,307,500,000.

16 CHEMICAL CORPS

17 CHEMICAL SERVICE, ARMY

18 For purchase, manufacture, and test of chemical agents
19 and toxic substances, incendiary materials and munitions,
20 gas masks, or other offensive or defensive materials or appli-
21 ances required for chemical purposes, investigations, research,
22 design, experimentation, and operation, purchase of chemi-
23 cals, special scientific and technical apparatus and instru-
24 ments, including services connected therewith; maintenance

1 and repair of plants, buildings, and equipment, and the
2 machinery therefor; receiving, storing, and issuing of sup-
3 plies, comprising police and office duties, rents, tolls, fuels,
4 gasoline, lubricants, paints and oils, rope and cordage, light,
5 water, advertising, stationery, typewriting and computing
6 machines including their exchange, office furniture, tools, and
7 instruments; incidental expenses; libraries of the Chemical
8 Corps; expenses incidental to the organization, training, and
9 equipment of special gas troops not otherwise provided for,
10 including the training of the Army in Chemical Corps activi-
11 ties, both offensive and defensive, together with the necessary
12 schools, tactical demonstrations, and maneuvers; expenses
13 of chemical projectile filling plants and proving grounds, in-
14 cluding maintenance of rail transportation, repairs, altera-
15 tions, accessories, building and repairing butts and targets,
16 clearing and grading ranges; \$122,560,000.

ARMY TRAINING

18 For miscellaneous supplies, material, equipment, and
19 services, tuition and other incidental expenses, not
20 otherwise provided for, essential in conducting instruc-
21 tion in service schools and elsewhere; contingencies
22 for the Commandant of the National War College, to be
23 expended in his discretion (not exceeding \$1,000); pur-

1 chase, repair, and cleaning of uniforms for guards at the
2 National War College; operation of the Office, Chief, Army
3 Field Forces, subordinate commands, installations, and
4 boards, not otherwise provided for, \$22,300,000.

5 UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

6 MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION

7 For text and reference books for instruction; increase
8 and expense of library; office equipment and supplies; sta-
9 tionery, blank books, forms, diplomas for graduates;
10 expense of lectures; apparatus, equipment, supplies, and
11 materials for purpose of instruction and athletics, and
12 maintenance and repair thereof; musical instruments and
13 maintenance of band; care and maintenance of organ;
14 equipment for cadet mess; postage, telephones, and tele-
15 grams; freight and expressage; for commutation of rations
16 to the cadet mess for civilians employed and subsisted at
17 cadet mess in the same amount as deducted from each civil-
18 ian's pay for said rations; expenses, including not to exceed
19 \$95,000 for contingencies, incident to the observance of the
20 Sesquicentennial of the Military Academy; contingencies for
21 Superintendent of the Military Academy (not exceeding
22 \$5,200) and for the Commandant of Cadets (not exceeding
23 \$1,200), to be expended in their respective discretions;
24 expenses of the members of the Board of Visitors (not ex-
25 ceeding \$1,500) ; contingent fund, to be expended under the

1 direction of the Academic Board (not exceeding \$1,000) ;
 2 improvement, repair, and maintenance of buildings and
 3 grounds (including roads, walls, and fences) ; shooting gal-
 4 leries and ranges; cooking, heating, and lighting apparatus
 5 and fixtures and operation and maintenance thereof; mainte-
 6 nance of water, sewer, and plumbing systems; maintenance of
 7 and repairs to cadet camp; fire-extinguishing apparatus; ma-
 8 chinery and tools and repairs of same; policing buildings and
 9 grounds; furniture, refrigerators, and lockers for Government-
 10 owned buildings at the Academy and repair and maintenance
 11 thereof; fuel for heat, light, and power; and other necessary
 12 incidental expenses in the discretion of the superintendent;
 13 in all, \$6,305,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$3,750 of
 14 this amount shall be available to liquidate the indebtedness
 15 of cadets separated from the service for any reason during
 16 their first year, who at the time of their separation are in
 17 debt to the Treasurer of the United States Military Academy.

18 CIVILIAN COMPONENTS

19 ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

20 For expenses necessary for equipping, maintaining, op-
 21 erating and training the Army National Guard, including
 22 expenses of camps, airfields, storage facilities, buildings,
 23 structures, rifle ranges, and facilities, the purchase (not
 24 to exceed one hundred) and hire of passenger motor vehicles
 25 for official use only, and the modification, repair, maintenance

1 and operation of airplanes; transportation of things; personal
2 services in the National Guard Bureau and services of per-
3 sonnel of the Army National Guard employed as civilians
4 (without regard to their military rank) necessary for the
5 care, maintenance, modification and repair of materials and
6 equipment, for Federal property and custodial accounting
7 work, and for administrative and such other duties as may
8 be required; medical and hospital treatment of members
9 of the Army National Guard who suffer injury or con-
10 tract disease in line of duty and other expenses connected
11 therewith as authorized by law; pay at a rate not less than
12 \$2,400 per annum and travel of property and disbursing offi-
13 cers for the United States; travel expenses (other than mile-
14 age), at the same rates as authorized by law for Army
15 National Guard personnel on active Federal duty, of Army
16 National Guard division and regimental commanders while
17 inspecting units in compliance with National Guard regula-
18 tions when specifically authorized by the Chief, National
19 Guard Bureau; attendance of Army National Guard per-
20 sonnel at military service schools; drill pay of the Army
21 National Guard; subsistence for drills of eight or more hours
22 duration in any one calendar day; expenses of temporary
23 duty travel of personnel of the Regular Army in connection
24 with activities of the Army National Guard; procurement
25 and issue to the Army National Guard of the several States,

1 Territories, and the District of Columbia of military equip-
2 ment and supplies, as provided by law, including motor-
3 propelled vehicles and airplanes; and expenses of repair,
4 modification, issue, maintenance and use of supplies, material
5 and equipment, and such property may be furnished from
6 Army stocks without reimbursement subject to recall for
7 Army requirements; \$202,982,000, to remain available
8 until June 30, 1953: *Provided*, That the number of care-
9 takers authorized to be employed for any one unit or pool
10 under the provisions of section 90 of the National Defense
11 Act of June 3, 1916, as amended, may be such as is deemed
12 necessary by the Secretary of the Army.

13 ORGANIZED RESERVES

14 For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, and trans-
15 portation (including mileage, actual and necessary expenses,
16 or per diem in lieu thereof), and medical and hospital
17 treatment and related expenses, as authorized by law, for
18 personnel of the Organized Reserve Corps while on active
19 duty undergoing Reserve training or while performing drills
20 or equivalent duty; maintenance, operation, rental, repair,
21 and other necessary expenses of facilities for the training
22 and administration of the Organized Reserve Corps; ex-
23 penses of temporary-duty travel in connection with activities
24 of the Organized Reserve Corps; transportation of things;
25 purchase (not to exceed two hundred) and hire of passenger.

1 motor vehicles and aircraft; supplies, services, matériel, and
2 equipment, not otherwise provided for, necessary to train and
3 equip the Organized Reserve Corps; and expenses of modifi-
4 cation, issue, maintenance, and use of supplies, matériel, and
5 equipment, which may be furnished without reimbursement
6 from Army stocks; \$104,810,000 to remain available until
7 June 30, 1953.

8 ARMY RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS

9 For expenses necessary for the operation of the Reserve
10 Officers' Training Corps, as authorized by law, including
11 procurement, maintenance, transportation, and issue of sup-
12 plies and equipment; pay, subsistence, allowances, trans-
13 portation (including mileage), and medical and hospital
14 treatment and related expenses for members of the Reserve
15 Officers' Training Corps as authorized by law; hire of
16 passenger motor vehicles; maintenance and operation of
17 facilities; establishment and maintenance of camps; cleaning
18 and laundering of uniforms and clothing at camps; expenses
19 of temporary duty travel in connection with activities of
20 the Reserve Officers' Training Corps; expenses for institu-
21 tions as authorized by section 1225, Revised Statutes, as
22 amended, and section 55c of the National Defense Act, as
23 amended (34 U. S. C. 1129; 10 U. S. C. 1180, 1181);
24 expenses of modification, issue, maintenance, and use of
25 supplies, materials, and equipment, which may be furnished

1 without reimbursement from Army stocks; to remain avail-
2 able until June 30, 1953, \$27,141,000.

3 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY CIVILIAN COMPONENTS

4 For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation
5 and conversion of facilities for the training and administration
6 of the reserve components, including contributions therefor,
7 as authorized by the Act of September 11, 1950 (64 Stat.
8 829), without regard to sections 1136 and 3734, Revised
9 Statutes, as amended, and land and interests therein may be
10 acquired and construction prosecuted thereon prior to the
11 approval of title by the Attorney General as required by
12 section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; hire of
13 passenger motor vehicles; \$24,000,000, to remain available
14 until expended.

15 DEPARTMENTAL SALARIES AND EXPENSES

16 SALARIES, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

17 For compensation for personal services in the Depart-
18 ment of the Army proper, to be accounted for as one fund,
19 as follows:

20 Office of Secretary of the Army: Secretary of the Army,
21 Under Secretary of the Army, Assistant Secretaries of the
22 Army, and other personal services, \$3,625,000.

23 Office of Chief of Staff, \$9,500,000;

24 Adjutant General's Office, \$16,500,000;

25 Office of the Inspector General, \$259,000;

- 1 Office of the Judge Advocate General, \$700,000;
2 Office of the Chief of Finance, \$1,540,500;
3 Office of the Quartermaster General, \$9,625,000;
4 Office of the Chief of Transportation, \$3,800,000;
5 Office of the Chief Signal Officer, \$3,750,000;
6 Office of the Provost Marshal General, \$245,000;
7 Office of the Surgeon General, \$3,100,000;
8 Office of Chief of Engineers, \$5,400,000;
9 Office of Chief of Ordnance, \$6,500,000;
10 Office of Chief, Chemical Corps, \$1,500,000;
11 Office of Chief of Chaplains, \$170,000.
12 CONTINGENT EXPENSES, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
13 For miscellaneous expenses at the seat of government,
14 \$30,000,000.

15 DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

16 TITLE IV

17 MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY

- 18 For pay, allowances, subsistence, interest on deposits,
19 gratuities, clothing, permanent change of station travel (in-
20 cluding expenses of temporary duty between permanent duty
21 stations), and transportation of dependents, as authorized
22 by law, for regular and reserve personnel on active duty

1 (except those on active duty while undergoing reserve
2 training) , \$2,456,475,000.

3 MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVAL RESERVE

4 For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities,
5 and travel, as authorized by law, for personnel of the Naval
6 Reserve on active duty while undergoing reserve training,
7 or while performing drills or equivalent duty \$62,718,000.

8 MILITARY PERSONNEL, OFFICER CANDIDATES

9 For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, and
10 travel, as authorized by law, for officer candidates,
11 including midshipmen at the Naval Academy, aviation
12 midshipmen, aviation cadets, regular and contract enrollees
13 in the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and Reserve
14 officer candidates; and retainer pay authorized by the Act of
15 August 13, 1946 (34 U. S. C. 1020h) , to remain available
16 until June 30, 1953; \$19,348,000.

17 NAVY PERSONNEL, GENERAL EXPENSES

18 For expenses necessary for general training, education
19 and administration of regular and reserve personnel, includ-
20 ing tuition, cash book allowances of not to exceed \$50 for
21 each Naval Aviation College program student, and other

1 costs incurred at civilian schools, general training aids and
2 devices, procurement of military personnel, and authorized
3 annuity premiums and retirement benefits for civilian mem-
4 bers of teaching staffs; maintenance and operation of Navy
5 training and personnel facilities, including the Naval Acad-
6 emy, Naval Postgraduate School, Naval War College, Naval
7 Home, Navy training schools and facilities, disciplinary
8 barracks, and retraining commands; rent; hire of motor
9 vehicles; not to exceed \$30 per person for civilian clothing,
10 including an overcoat when necessary, for enlisted person-
11 nel discharged otherwise than honorably; welfare and recre-
12 ation; medals and other awards; research and development;
13 and departmental salaries; \$97,570,000.

14 **MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS**

15 For pay, allowances, subsistence, interest on deposits,
16 gratuities, clothing, permanent change of station travel (in-
17 cluding expenses of temporary duty between permanent
18 duty stations), and transportation of dependents, as author-
19 ized by law, for regular and reserve personnel on active duty
20 (except those on active duty while undergoing reserve
21 training), \$565,459,000.

22 **MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS RESERVE**

23 For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities,
24 and travel, as authorized by law, for personnel of the Marine

1 Corps Reserve and the Marine Corps platoon leaders class
2 on active duty while undergoing reserve training, or while
3 performing drills or equivalent duty, \$15,145,000.

4 MARINE CORPS TROOPS AND FACILITIES

5 For necessary expenses of troops and facilities of the
6 Marine Corps not otherwise provided for, including mainte-
7 nance and operation of equipment and facilities, and pro-
8 curement of military personnel; training and education of
9 regular and reserve personnel, including tuition and other
10 costs incurred at civilian schools; welfare and recreation;
11 not to exceed \$30 per person for civilian clothing, including
12 an overcoat when necessary, for enlisted personnel dis-
13 charged otherwise than honorably; research and develop-
14 ent; procurement and manufacture of ordnance, ammuni-
15 tion, and other military supplies, equipment and clothing;
16 purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles; transporta-
17 tion of things; industrial mobilization; rent; medals, awards,
18 emblems and other insignia; care of the dead; and depart-
19 mental salaries; \$1,018,120,000.

20 AIRCRAFT AND FACILITIES

21 For expenses necessary for maintenance, operation, and
22 modification of aircraft; maintenance, operation, and lease
23 of air stations and facilities, testing laboratories, fleet and
24 other aviation activities; procurement of services, supplies,

1 special clothing, tools, materials, and equipment, including
2 rescue boats; research and development; industrial mobiliza-
3 tion; aerological services, supplies, and equipment for the
4 Navy and Marine Corps; and departmental salaries; \$923,-
5 393,000: *Provided*, That the unexpended balance of the
6 appropriation for "Aviation, Navy, 1949" shall remain
7 available until June 30, 1952, for the liquidation of con-
8 tract obligations incurred thereunder during the fiscal year
9 1949 for aircraft equipment and research and development.

10 CONSTRUCTION OF AIRCRAFT AND RELATED
11 PROCUREMENT

12 For construction, procurement, and modernization of
13 aircraft and equipment, including ordnance, spare parts, and
14 accessories therefor; expansion of public and not to ex-
15 ceed \$100,000 for expansion of private plants, includ-
16 ing the land necessary therefor, without regard to section
17 3734, Revised Statutes, as amended, and such land, and
18 interests therein, may be acquired and construction pros-
19 ecuted thereon prior to approval of title by the Attorney
20 General as required by section 355, Revised Statutes, as
21 amended; procurement and installation of equipment in public
22 or private plants; and departmental salaries necessary for
23 the purposes of this appropriation, to remain available until
24 expended, \$4,000,000,000, of which \$450,000,000 is for

1 liquidation of obligations incurred under authority heretofore
2 granted to enter into contracts for the foregoing purposes.

3 SHIPS AND FACILITIES

4 For expenses necessary for design, maintenance, opera-
5 tion, and alteration of vessels; maintenance and operation of
6 facilities; procurement of plant equipment, appliances, and
7 machine tools, and installation thereof in public or private
8 plants; procurement of equipment, supplies, special clothing
9 and services, including subsistence and other expenses of
10 civilian crews of vessels; installation, maintenance, and re-
11 moval of ships' ordnance; lease of facilities and docks;
12 charter and hire of vessels; relief of vessels in distress; mari-
13 time salvage services; research and development; industrial
14 mobilization; and departmental salaries; \$1,537,452,000.

15 CONSTRUCTION OF SHIPS

16 For an additional amount for "Construction of Ships,"
17 to remain available until expended, \$77,353,000, of which
18 \$55,961,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred pur-
19 suant to authority heretofore granted under this head:
20 *Provided*, That the total of obligations incurred under this
21 head for construction, conversion, or replacement, approved
22 after July 17, 1947, shall not exceed \$1,085,663,000.

SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION

For expenses necessary for the construction, acquisition, or conversion of vessels as authorized by the Act of March 10, 1951 (Public Law 3), or otherwise authorized by law, including plant equipment, appliances, and machine tools, and installation thereof in public or private plants, and departmental salaries necessary for the purposes of this appropriation, \$1,343,297,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the amount heretofore appropriated under the head "Construction of ships" for the purposes of the Act of March 10, 1951, is hereby transferred to and merged with this appropriation: *Provided further*, That the total of obligations incurred for the foregoing purposes shall not exceed \$1,480,297,000.

ORDNANCE AND FACILITIES

For expenses necessary for the production and procurement of Navy ordnance and ammunition (except ordnance for new aircraft, new ships, and ships authorized for conversion) ; alteration, preservation, and handling of ordnance and ammunition; maintenance of ordnance (except installation, maintenance, and removal of ships' ordnance, and line maintenance of ordnance installed in aircraft) ; maintenance and operation of ordnance facilities; procurement of equipment, supplies, special clothing and services; procurement of plant equipment, appliances, and machine tools, and installa-

tion thereof in naval or private plants; lease of facilities; research and development; industrial mobilization; and departmental salaries; \$1,335,668,000.

ORDNANCE FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION

For an additional amount for "Ordnance for new construction," to remain available until expended, \$52,445,000, for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority heretofore granted under this head.

ORDNANCE FOR SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION

For expenses necessary for the construction and procurement of armor and armament for vessels provided for in the appropriation "Shipbuilding and conversion," including plant equipment, appliances, and machine tools, and installation thereof in public or private plants, and departmental salaries necessary for the purposes of this appropriation, \$431,390,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the total of obligations incurred under this head shall not exceed \$431,390,000.

INCREASE AND REPLACEMENT OF NAVAL VESSELS

CONSTRUCTION AND MACHINERY

For an additional amount for "Construction and machinery", including, during the current fiscal year, personal services in the Bureau of Ships necessary for the purposes of this appropriation, \$45,000,000.

1 ARMOR, ARMAMENT, AND AMMUNITION

2 For an additional amount for "Armor, armament, and
3 ammunition," including, during the current fiscal year, per-
4 sonal services in the Bureau of Ordnance necessary for the
5 purposes of this appropriation, \$12,656,000.

6 MEDICAL CARE

7 For expenses necessary for maintenance and operation
8 of naval hospitals, medical centers, clinics, schools, research
9 facilities, the medical supply system, and other medical
10 activities; procurement of ambulances, medical and dental
11 supplies, equipment and services; rent; instruction of medical
12 personnel in naval hospitals, naval medical schools, and
13 civilian schools; research and development; industrial mo-
14 bilization; care of the dead; and departmental salaries;
15 \$135,770,000.

16 CIVIL ENGINEERING

17 For expenses necessary for maintenance and operation
18 of district public works offices, public works centers, advance
19 base depots, construction battalion centers, defense housing
20 projects, other civil engineering facilities, and shore activities
21 not otherwise provided for; procurement of services, supplies
22 and equipment for the foregoing activities; purchase and
23 hire of passenger motor vehicles; research and development;
24 engineering services; industrial mobilization; and depart-
25 mental salaries; \$196,488,000.

PUBLIC WORKS

For an additional amount for "Public works", to remain available until expended, \$50,414,000, for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority heretofore granted under this head to enter into contracts.

FACILITIES

For expenses necessary for acquisition, construction, and installation of production facilities and equipment, and test facilities and equipment (other than those for research and development), including the land necessary therefor, without regard to section 3734, Revised Statutes, as amended, and such land, and interests therein, may be acquired and construction prosecuted thereon prior to the approval of title by the Attorney General as required by section 355, Revised Statutes, as amended, such amounts as may be determined by the Secretary of the Navy, and approved by the Secretary of Defense and the Bureau of the Budget, and said amounts shall be derived by transfer from any appropriations available to the Department of the Navy, during the fiscal year 1952, for procurement of equipment for installation or use in private plants: *Provided*, That the total amount so transferred shall not exceed \$100,000,000.

RESEARCH

For conduct and encouragement of research and development, not otherwise provided for; dissemination of scientific

1 information; administration of patents, trade-marks, and
2 copyrights; maintenance and operation of research and de-
3 velopment facilities; development, installation, and main-
4 tenance of special devices (including specialized housing
5 therefor) ; procurement of supplies, services, and equipment;
6 departmental salaries; and other expenses necessary in carry-
7 ing out the Act of August 1, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 475), to
8 remain available until expended, \$69,698,000.

9 SERVICE-WIDE SUPPLY AND FINANCE

10 For expenses necessary for maintenance and operation
11 of service-wide supply and finance activities, including supply
12 depots and centers, clothing depots, market and purchasing
13 offices, supply demand control points, fleet fueling facilities,
14 overseas air cargo terminals, regional accounting and dis-
15 bursing offices, the material catalog office, the cost inspection
16 service, and other service-wide supply and finance facilities,
17 as designated by the Secretary; procurement of supplies,
18 services, special clothing, and equipment; rent; intra-Navy
19 transportation of things, all transportation of Navy stock
20 fund material, and transportation of household effects; re-
21 search and development; industrial mobilization; losses in
22 exchange and in the accounts of disbursing officers, as au-
23 thorized by law; and departmental salaries; \$485,102,000.

NAVY STOCK FUND

For additional working capital for the Navy stock fund, established pursuant to the National Security Act Amendments of 1949, \$450,000,000.

SERVICE-WIDE OPERATIONS

For expenses necessary for maintenance and operation of the Naval Observatory, the Hydrographic Office, Service-wide Communications, Naval Records Centers, Naval District Headquarters (except training and public works offices), River Commands, and other service-wide operations and functions not otherwise provided for; procurement of supplies, services and equipment for activities financed hereunder; Latin-American cooperation; not to exceed \$42,127,000 for emergencies and extraordinary expenses, as authorized by section 6 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 419c), to be expended on the approval and authority of the Secretary, and his determination shall be final and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the Government; and departmental salaries; \$150,779,000.

OPERATION AND CONSERVATION OF NAVAL PETROLEUM

RESERVES

For expenses necessary for exploration, prospecting, conservation, development, use, and operation of the naval petroleum reserves, as authorized by law, \$11,908,000.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

TITLE V

AIRCRAFT AND RELATED PROCUREMENT

For construction, procurement, and modification of aircraft and equipment, armor and armament, spare parts and accessories therefor; specialized equipment; expansion of public and private plants, Government-owned equipment and installation thereof in such plants, erection of structures, and acquisition of land without regard to section 1136, Revised Statutes, as amended, for the foregoing and other purposes, and such land, and interests therein, may be acquired and construction prosecuted thereon prior to the approval of title by the Attorney General as required by section 355, Revised Statutes, as amended; industrial mobilization, including maintenance of reserve plants and equipment and procurement planning; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, including rents and transportation of things; to remain available until expended; \$11,215,800,000, of which \$625,000,000 is for payment of obligations incurred under authority heretofore granted to enter into contracts for the foregoing purposes: *Provided*, That the unexpended balances of the appropriations granted under the head "Air Corps, Army," 1948, and "General expenses, U. S. Air Force," 1949, shall remain available until June

1 30, 1952, for the payment of obligations incurred thereunder
2 prior to July 1, 1948, and July 1, 1949, respectively.

3 MAJOR PROCUREMENT OTHER THAN AIRCRAFT

4 For procurement of supplies, materials, and equipment,
5 and spare parts therefor, not otherwise provided for; elec-
6 tronic and communication equipment; and the purchase of
7 passenger motor vehicles, \$1,750,000,000, to remain avail-
8 able until expended.

9 ACQUISITION AND CONSTRUCTION OF REAL PROPERTY

10 For an additional amount for "Acquisition and construc-
11 tion of real property", to remain available until expended,
12 \$85,000,000, for payment of obligations incurred under
13 authority heretofore granted under this head to enter into
14 contracts.

15 MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION

16 For expenses necessary for the maintenance, operation,
17 and administration of the activities of the Air Force, includ-
18 ing the United States Air Force Reserve and the Air Re-
19 serve Officers' Training Corps; maintenance, operation, and
20 modification of aircraft; transportation of things; rents at the
21 seat of government and elsewhere, and in administering the
22 provisions of 43 U. S. C. 315q payments of rents may be
23 made in advance; repair of facilities; field printing plants;
24 procurement of ambulances; hire of passenger motor vehicles;

1 training and instruction of military and civilian personnel of
2 the Air Force, including tuition and related expenses; pay,
3 allowances and travel expenses of contract surgeons; utility
4 services for buildings erected at private cost as authorized
5 by law (10 U. S. C. 1346), and buildings on military res-
6ervations authorized by Air Force regulations to be used for
7 welfare and recreational purposes; rental of land or pur-
8 chase of options to rent land without reference to section
9 3648, Revised Statutes, as amended, use or repair of private
10 property, and other necessary expenses of combat maneuvers;
11 organizational clothing and equipage; payment of exchange
12 fees and exchange losses incurred by Air Force disbursing
13 officers or their agents; losses in the accounts of Air Force
14 disbursing officers as authorized by law (31 U. S. C. 95a;
15 50 U. S. C. 1705-1707; Act of July 26, 1947, Public Law
16 248); burial of the dead as authorized by law (10 U. S. C.
17 916-916d; 5 U. S. C. 103a), including remains of person-
18 nel of the Air Force of the United States who die while on
19 active duty, travel allowances of attendants accompanying
20 remains, and acquisition by lease or otherwise of temporary
21 burial sites; conduct of schoolrooms, service clubs, chapels,
22 and other instructional, entertainment, and welfare expenses
23 for enlisted men, not otherwise provided for; expenses for
24 inter-American cooperation as authorized for the Navy by
25 the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 421f), for Latin-
American cooperation; payments of deficiency judgments and

1 interests thereon arising out of condemnation proceedings
2 heretofore instituted; and special services by contract or
3 otherwise; \$3,208,442,000.

4 MILITARY PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS

5 For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, transportation,
6 interest on deposits of enlisted personnel, and travel in kind
7 for cadets and all other personnel of the Air Force of the
8 United States on active duty (other than personnel of the
9 Reserve components, including the Air National Guard,
10 on active duty while undergoing reserve training), in-
11 cluding commutation of quarters, subsistence supplies for
12 issue as rations to enlisted personnel, cloth and materials and
13 clothing for issue and sale, and clothing allowances, as
14 authorized by law; and, in connection with personnel paid
15 from this appropriation, for rental of camp sites and local
16 procurement of utility services and other necessary expenses
17 incident to individual or troop movements (including pack-
18 ing and unpacking and transportation of organizational equip-
19 ment), ice, meals for recruiting parties, monetary allowances
20 for liquid coffee for troops when supplied cooked or travel
21 rations, altering and fitting clothing, and commutation of
22 rations, as authorized by law, to enlisted personnel, including
23 those sick in hospitals (to be paid to the surgeon in charge);
24 transportation, as authorized by law, of dependents, baggage,
25 and household effects of personnel paid from this appropria-

1 tion ; rations for civilian employees when entitled thereto, appli-
2 cants for enlistment, prisoners of war, and general prisoners ;
3 subsistence supplies for resale, as authorized by law ; commu-
4 tation of rations, as authorized by regulations, to applicants
5 for enlistment, civilian employees entitled to subsistence at
6 public expense, and general prisoners, while sick in hospitals
7 (to be paid to the surgeon in charge) ; subsistence of super-
8 numeraries necessitated by emergent military circumstances ;
9 issues of toilet articles and barbers' and tailors' material to
10 general prisoners confined at military posts without pay and
11 allowances, applicants for enlistment, and recruits upon first
12 enlistment ; civilian clothing and when necessary an overcoat,
13 the cost of all not to exceed \$30, for each person upon each
14 release from a military prison, each enlisted man discharged
15 otherwise than honorably, each enlisted man convicted by a
16 civil court for an offense resulting in confinement in a civil
17 prison, and each enlisted man interned, or discharged with-
18 out internment as an alien enemy ; expenses of apprehension
19 and delivery of deserters, stragglers, and escaped military
20 prisoners ; payment, in the discretion of the Secretary, of
21 rewards (not to exceed \$25 in any one case) for the appre-
22 hension of deserters ; confinement of military prisoners in
23 nonmilitary facilities ; donations of not to exceed \$25 to each
24 civilian prisoner upon each release from a military prison, to
25 each enlisted man discharged otherwise than honorably upon

1 each release from confinement under court-martial sentence,
2 and to each person discharged for fraudulent enlistment;
3 expenses of courts, boards, and commissions; welfare; and
4 medals and other awards; \$3,016,700,000.

5 RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

6 For expenses necessary for basic and applied scientific
7 research and development, by contract or otherwise, and
8 transportation of things, to remain available until expended,
9 \$425,000,000.

10 RESERVE PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS

11 For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, and travel for
12 personnel of the United States Air Force Reserve and the
13 Air Reserve Officers' Training Corps, while on active duty
14 undergoing reserve training or while performing drills or
15 equivalent duty, or undergoing training and instruction; and
16 the procurement and issue of uniforms to institutions neces-
17 sary for the training of the Air Reserve Officers' Training
18 Corps, as authorized by law, \$17,543,000, to remain avail-
19 able until June 30, 1953.

20 AIR NATIONAL GUARD

21 For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, transportation
22 (including mileage, actual and necessary expenses, or per
23 diem in lieu thereof), medical and hospital treatment and
24 related expenses, for members of the Air National Guard
25 while undergoing Reserve training or while performing drills

1 or equivalent duty, including officers on duty under section 5,
2 National Defense Act, as authorized by law; travel expenses
3 (other than mileage), on the same basis as authorized by law
4 for Air National Guard personnel on active Federal duty, of
5 Air National Guard commanders while inspecting units in
6 compliance with National Guard regulations when specifically
7 authorized by the Chief, National Guard Bureau; establish-
8 ment, maintenance, operation, repair, and other necessary
9 expenses of facilities for the training and administration of the
10 Air National Guard, including construction of facilities, and
11 additions, extensions, alterations, improvements, and rehabili-
12 tation of existing facilities, as authorized by the Act of
13 September 11, 1950 (Public Law 783); maintenance, oper-
14 ation, and modification of aircraft; transportation of things;
15 purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles; procurement
16 and issue to the Air National Guard of the several
17 States, Territories, and the District of Columbia of
18 supplies, materials, and equipment, as authorized by law;
19 and expenses incident to the maintenance and use of
20 supplies, materials, and equipment, including such as
21 may be furnished from stocks under the control of
22 agencies of the Department of Defense; \$87,900,000:
23 *Provided*, That the number of caretakers authorized
24 to be employed under the provisions of law (32 U. S. C.

1 42) may be such as is deemed necessary by the Secretary of
2 the Air Force.

3 CONTINGENCIES

4 For emergencies and military expenses, to be expended
5 on the authority or approval of the Secretary of the Air
6 Force, and such expenses may be accounted for solely on
7 his certificate, \$40,600,000.

8 TITLE VI—GENERAL PROVISIONS

9 SEC. 601. During the current fiscal year, the Secretary
10 of Defense and the Secretaries of the Air Force, Army, and
11 Navy, respectively, if they should deem it advantageous
12 to the national defense, and if in their opinions the existing
13 facilities of the Department of Defense are inadequate, are
14 authorized to procure services in accordance with section 15
15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), but at rates
16 for individuals not in excess of \$50 per day, and to pay in
17 connection therewith travel expenses of individuals, including
18 actual transportation and per diem in lieu of subsistence while
19 traveling from their homes or places of business to official
20 duty station and return as may be authorized by law: *Pro-*
21 *vided*, That such contracts may be renewed annually.

22 SEC. 602. Section 3648, Revised Statutes, shall not
23 apply, in the case of payments made from appropriations con-
24 tained in this Act, (1) to payments made in compliance

1 with the laws of foreign countries or their ministerial regula-
2 tions, (2) to payments for rent in such countries for such
3 periods as may be necessary to accord with local custom,
4 or (3) to payments made for tuition.

5 SEC. 603. During the current fiscal year, provisions of
6 law prohibiting the payment of compensation to, or employ-
7 ment of, any person not a citizen of the United States shall
8 not apply to personnel of the Department of Defense.

9 SEC. 604. No part of any appropriation contained in
10 this Act for "Pay and allowances" of military personnel
11 shall be used for any other purpose.

12 SEC. 605. The appropriations in this Act otherwise
13 available for travel or transportation which are current
14 on date of relief from duty station of personnel travel-
15 ing under orders may be charged with all expenses in
16 connection with such travel including transportation of de-
17 pendants and household goods, regardless of time of arrival
18 at destination of such personnel.

19 SEC. 606. Appropriations contained in this Act avail-
20 able for travel shall be available for all expenses incident to
21 attendance at meetings of technical, scientific, professional,
22 or other similar organizations.

23 SEC. 607. No part of any money appropriated in this
24 Act or included under any contract authority granted in
25 this Act shall be expended for the payment of any commis-

1 sion on any land purchase contract in excess of 2 per centum
2 of the purchase price.

3 SEC. 608. Such military and naval personnel as may
4 be detailed for duty with agencies not a part of the Depart-
5 ment of Defense on a reimbursement basis may be employed
6 in addition to the numbers otherwise authorized and appro-
7 priated for.

8 SEC. 609. No collection or reclamation shall be made
9 by the United States on account of any money paid to
10 assignees, transferees, or allottees, or to others for them,
11 under assignments, transfers, or allotments of pay and allow-
12 ances made under authority of law where liability might
13 exist with respect to such assignments, transfers, or allot-
14 ments or the use of such moneys, because of the death of
15 assignors, transferors, or allotters.

16 SEC. 610. Appropriations contained in this Act shall
17 be available for insurance of official motor vehicles in
18 foreign countries, when required by laws of such countries;
19 payments in advance of expenses determined by the investi-
20 gating officer to be necessary and in accord with local custom
21 for conducting investigations in foreign countries incident to
22 matters relating to the activities of the department concerned;
23 reimbursement of General Services Administration for se-
24 curity guard services for protection of confidential files;
25 examination of estimates of appropriations and Department

1 of Defense activities in the field and the use of such appro-
2 priations for such purpose shall be subject only to regulation
3 by the standing committees concerned; and all necessary
4 expenses, at the seat of government of the United States
5 of America or elsewhere, in connection with (1) instruction
6 and training, including tuition, not otherwise provided for,
7 of civilian employees, and (2) communication and other
8 services and supplies as may be necessary to carry out the
9 purposes of this Act.

10 SEC. 611. The appropriations contained in this Act
11 for the Air Force, Navy, and for the Army, which
12 are available for the procurement or manufacture of
13 supplies, materials, and equipment of special or technical
14 design may be used for the development and procurement of
15 gages, dies, jigs, and other special aids and appliances, pro-
16 duction studies, factory plans, and other production data,
17 including specifications and detailed drawings, and for the
18 purchase of designs, processes and manufacturing data, copy-
19 rights and letters patent, applications therefor, and licenses
20 thereunder pertaining to such supplies, equipment, and
21 materials for which the appropriations are made.

22 SEC. 612. Any appropriation available to the Air
23 Force, Army, or the Navy may, under such regulations as
24 the Secretary concerned may prescribe, be used for expenses
25 incident to the maintenance, pay, and allowances of prisoners

1 of war, other persons in Air Force, Army, or Navy custody
2 whose status is determined by the Secretary concerned to be
3 similar to prisoners of war, and persons detained in such
4 custody pursuant to Presidential proclamation.

5 SEC. 613. During the current fiscal year, without
6 deposit to the credit of the Treasurer of the United States
7 and withdrawal on money requisitions, receipts of public
8 moneys from sales or other sources by officers of the Depart-
9 ment of Defense on disbursing duty and charged in their
10 official accounts, except receipts to be credited to river and
11 harbor and flood-control appropriations, may be used by them
12 as required for current expenditures, all necessary bookkeep-
13 ing adjustments of appropriations, funds, and accounts to be
14 made in the settlement of their disbursing accounts.

15 SEC. 614. The Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of
16 the Air Force, and the Secretary of the Navy are authorized
17 to expend out of the Appropriations in this Act available for
18 construction or maintenance such amounts as may be required
19 for minor construction (except family quarters), extensions
20 to existing structures, and improvements, at facilities of the
21 Department concerned, but the cost of any project authorized
22 under this section which is not otherwise authorized shall not
23 exceed \$50,000, except that the limitation on the cost of any
24 such project which is determined by the Secretary of Defense
25 to be urgently required in the interests of national defense,

1 shall not exceed \$200,000: *Provided*, That the cost limita-
2 tions of this section shall not apply to amounts authorized to
3 be expended for emergency expenses on the approval of the
4 Secretary concerned.

5 SEC. 615. During the current fiscal year, appropriations
6 contained in this Act (except those for liquidation of
7 prior contract authorizations) shall not be obligated for con-
8 struction of family quarters for personnel at a cost per family
9 unit in excess of \$14,040 on housing units for generals;
10 \$12,040 on housing units for majors, lieutenant colonels and
11 colonels, or equivalent; \$11,040 on housing units for second
12 lieutenants, lieutenants, captains, and warrant officers, or
13 equivalent; or \$10,040 on housing units for enlisted per-
14 sonnel, except that when such units are constructed outside
15 the continental United States or in Alaska, the average cost
16 per unit of all such units shall not exceed \$25,850 and
17 in no event shall the individual cost exceed \$35,000.
18 The last proviso of section 3 of the Act of June 12, 1948
19 (Public Law 626), and the last proviso in the next to last
20 paragraph of section 3 of the Act of June 16, 1948 (Public
21 Law 653), shall not be applicable to appropriations made
22 herein or heretofore to carry out such Acts, in cases where
23 the Secretary of the Department concerned determines that
24 the erection of prefabricated family quarters will be more

1 advantageous to the United States than multiple type dwell-
2 ings of conventional construction.

3 SEC. 616. Appropriations for the Air Force and
4 the Army for the current fiscal year shall be available for
5 carrying out the purposes of Executive Order 9112 of March
6 26, 1942; for expenses in connection with the administration
7 of occupied areas; for distribution of trophies and devices as
8 authorized by law; for actual and necessary expenses or per
9 diem in lieu thereof authorized by law; and, except as other-
10 wise authorized by the Act of September 30, 1950 (Public
11 Law 874) , for primary and secondary schooling for depend-
12 ents of military and civilian personnel of the Department of
13 Defense residing on military installations or stationed in for-
14 eign countries, when the Secretary of the department
15 concerned finds that schools, if any, available in the locality,
16 are unable to provide adequately for the education of such
17 dependents; and appropriations for the Air Force for the
18 current fiscal year shall be available for expenses of tem-
19 porary duty travel of military personnel and for travel ex-
20 penses of civilians (other than on permanent change of
21 station) traveling in connection with the activities of the
22 Air Force.

23 SEC. 617. Appropriations for the Navy for the current
24 fiscal year shall be available for expenses in connec-
25 tion with the transfer to the United States of foreign vessels,

1 including pay, subsistence, transportation, and repatriation
2 of alien crews; expenses including those heretofore incurred
3 incident to the operation by the Navy of private plants taken
4 over at the direction of the President, and the Secretary of
5 the Navy may designate any naval appropriation to be
6 charged with such expenses, proper adjustment to be made
7 on the basis of final costs between applicable appropriations;
8 payment of rewards, as authorized by law, for information
9 leading to the discovery of missing naval property or the
10 recovery thereof, and except as otherwise authorized by the
11 Act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 874), for con-
12 tributions for the support of schools for dependents of military
13 and civilian personnel of the Department of Defense as
14 authorized by section 13 of the Act of August 2, 1946
15 (5 U. S. C. 421d).

16 SEC. 618. No part of any appropriation contained
17 in this Act shall be used directly or indirectly except for
18 temporary employment in case of emergency, for the
19 payment of any civilian for services rendered by him on
20 the Canal Zone while occupying a skilled, technical, clerical,
21 administrative, executive, or supervisory position unless such
22 person is a citizen of the United States of America or of the
23 Republic of Panama: *Provided, however,* (1) That, notwith-
24 standing the provision in the Act approved August 11, 1939
25 (53 Stat. 1409), limiting employment in the above-men-

tioned positions to citizens of the United States from and after the date of approval of said Act, citizens of Panama may be employed in such positions; (2) that at no time shall the number of Panamanian citizens employed in the above-mentioned positions exceed the number of citizens of the United States so employed, if United States citizens are available in continental United States or on the Canal Zone; (3) that nothing in this Act shall prohibit the continued employment of any person who shall have rendered fifteen or more years of faithful and honorable service on the Canal Zone; (4) that in the selection of personnel for skilled, technical, administrative, clerical, supervisory, or executive positions, the controlling factors in filling these positions shall be efficiency, experience, training, and education; (5) that all citizens of Panama and the United States rendering skilled, technical, clerical, administrative, executive, or supervisory service on the Canal Zone under the terms of this Act (a) shall normally be employed not more than forty hours per week, (b) may receive as compensation equal rates of pay based upon rates paid for similar employment in continental United States plus 25 per centum; (6) this entire section shall apply only to persons employed in skilled, technical, clerical, administrative, executive, or supervisory positions on the Canal Zone directly or indirectly by any branch of the United States Government or by any corporation or

1 company whose stock is owned wholly or in part by the
2 United States Government: *Provided further*, That the
3 President may suspend from time to time in whole or in part
4 compliance with this section if he should deem such course
5 to be in the public interest.

6 SEC. 619. Insofar as practicable, the Secretary of
7 Defense shall assist American small business to participate
8 equitably in the furnishing of commodities and services
9 financed with funds appropriated under this Act by mak-
10 ing available or causing to be made available to suppliers
11 in the United States, and particularly to small independent
12 enterprises, information, as far in advance as possible, with
13 respect to purchases proposed to be financed with funds
14 appropriated under this Act, and by making available or
15 causing to be made available to purchasing and contracting
16 agencies of the Department of Defense information as to
17 commodities and services produced and furnished by small
18 independent enterprises in the United States, and by other-
19 wise helping to give small business an opportunity to partici-
20 pate in the furnishing of commodities and services financed
21 with funds appropriated by this Act.

22 SEC. 620. During the current fiscal year, commuted ra-
23 tions for enlisted personnel of the uniformed services (as
24 defined in the Career Compensation Act of 1949) on leave,
25 or otherwise authorized to mess separately, shall be equiv-

1 alent to the cost of the ration as determined by the Sec-
2 retary of Defense.

3 SEC. 621. No appropriation contained in this Act shall
4 be available for expenses of operation of messes (other
5 than organized messes which are financed principally
6 from nonappropriated funds) at which meals are sold to
7 officers or civilians except under regulations approved by
8 the Secretary of Defense, which shall (except under un-
9 usual or extraordinary circumstances) establish rates for
10 such meals sufficient to provide reimbursement of operating
11 expenses and food costs to the appropriations concerned:
12 *Provided*, That, for the purposes of this section, payments
13 for meals at the rates established hereunder may be made
14 in cash or by deductions from the pay of civilian employees.

15 SEC. 622. No part of any appropriation contained
16 in this Act shall be available until expended unless ex-
17 pressly so provided elsewhere in this or some other appro-
18 priation Act.

19 SEC. 623. No part of any appropriation contained
20 in this Act shall be available for or on account of
21 the supply or replacement of table linen, dishes, glassware,
22 silver, and kitchen utensils for use in the residences or
23 quarters of officers on shore (other than for field messes,
24 messes temporarily set up on shore for bachelor officers and
25 officers attached to seagoing or district defense vessels, to

1 aviation units based on seagoing vessels, to the fleet air bases,
2 to the submarine bases, or to landing forces and expeditions),
3 except in accordance with regulations approved by the Sec-
4 retary of Defense, which shall provide for uniform practices
5 among all of the services.

6 SEC. 624. The provisions of the Act of February 9,
7 1946 (60 Stat. 3), shall be applicable to the appropriations
8 of the Army and Air Force for military pay for the current
9 fiscal year, upon certification by the appropriate agency
10 of the department concerned.

11 SEC. 625. Not more than \$25,000,000 of the amounts
12 received during the current fiscal year by each of the De-
13 partments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force as proceeds
14 from the sale of scrap or salvage materials, shall be available
15 during the current fiscal year for expenses of transportation,
16 demilitarization, and other preparation for sale or salvage
17 of military supplies, equipment, and matériel: *Provided*,
18 That a report of receipts and disbursements under this limita-
19 tion shall be made quarterly to the Committees on Appro-
20 priations of the Congress.

21 SEC. 626. During the current fiscal year, the President
22 may exempt appropriations, funds, and contract author-
23 izations, available for military functions under the Depart-
24 ment of Defense, from the provisions of subsection (c) of
25 section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, whenever

1 he deems such action to be necessary in the interest of
2 national defense.

3 SEC. 627. Appropriations available during the current
4 fiscal year for the pay and allowances of midshipmen ap-
5 pointed under paragraph (b) of section 3 of the Act of
6 August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1058), as amended (34 U. S. C.
7 1020b), shall be available for a 50 per centum increase of
8 the pay of such midshipmen while in flight training or on
9 other flight duty.

10 SEC. 628. No appropriation contained in this Act shall
11 be available for any direct expense (including commercial
12 transportation in the United States to the place of sale but
13 excluding all transportation outside the United States) in
14 connection with the maintenance, conduct, operation, or
15 management of sales commissaries, or commissary stores, of
16 agencies of the Department of Defense, except where reim-
17 bursement for such expenses is to be made, in accordance
18 with regulations approved by the Secretary of Defense, to
19 the appropriations concerned from the proceeds of sales
20 therein: *Provided*, That hereafter the proviso under the head
21 "Subsistence of the Army," in the Army Appropriation Act,
22 fiscal year 1885, shall not apply to sales by sales commis-
23 saries or commissary stores and such sales shall not be made
24 at prices insufficient to cover the direct expenses of said activi-
25 ties and the cost of articles sold: *Provided further*, That,

1 under unusual or extraordinary circumstances, the cost of
2 pay and allowances of military personnel may, in the dis-
3 cretion of the Secretary of Defense, be excluded from the
4 reimbursements required under this section.

5 SEC. 629. No part of any appropriation contained in
6 this Act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any
7 person who engages in a strike against the Government of
8 the United States or who is a member of an organization
9 of Government employees that asserts the right to strike
10 against the Government of the United States, or who ad-
11 vocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates,
12 the overthrow of the Government of the United States by
13 force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an
14 affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the
15 person making the affidavit has not contrary to the provisions
16 of this section engaged in a strike against the Government of
17 the United States, is not a member of an organization of
18 Government employees that asserts the right to strike against
19 the Government of the United States, or that such person
20 does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization
21 that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the
22 United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That
23 any person who engages in a strike against the Government
24 of the United States or who is a member of an organization
25 of Government employees that asserts the right to strike

1 against the Government of the United States, or who advo-
2 cates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates,
3 the overthrow of the Government of the United States by
4 force or violence and accepts employment the salary or
5 wages for which are paid from any appropriation contained
6 in this Act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction,
7 shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned for not
8 more than one year, or both: *Provided further*, That the
9 above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in
10 substitution for, any other provisions of existing law.

11 SEC. 630. This Act may be cited as the "Department
12 of Defense Appropriation Act, 1952".

82^D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 5054

[Report No. 790]

A BILL

Making appropriations for the National Security Council, the National Security Resources Board, and for military functions administered by the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

By Mr. MAHON

AUGUST 6, 1951

Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

House of Representatives

MONDAY, AUGUST 6, 1951

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Clyde Freed, Jr., First Baptist Church, El Dorado, Ark., offered the following prayer:

From Thee, our Heavenly Father, we ask Thy blessing upon our great Nation and upon these leaders of our Nation. We thank Thee, our Father, for those who have made our freedom possible and for those, our Father, this morning who fight for our freedom. We pray that Thy divine protection may be with them. Then for those, our Father, our leaders this morning hour, in these hours of decision and destiny, we pray that Thy hand of leadership may be upon them, Thy heart of wisdom may lead them.

These things we pray in the name of Him who is peace, who is leadership, who is the one who can guide us in this world, who is salvation, Christ Jesus, God's Son. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, August 2, 1951, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Hawks, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On August 2, 1951:

H. R. 1072. An act to amend the existing law to provide the privilege of renewing expiring 5-year level-premium-term policies of United States Government life insurance;

H. R. 1201. An act to amend section 4 of the act of March 2, 1933 (47 Stat. 1423), as amended, so as to provide that a mess operated under the direction of a Supply Corps officer can be operated either on a quantity or on a monetary-ration basis;

H. R. 3018. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the city of Klamath Falls, Oreg., all right, title, and interest of the United States of America in certain lands in Klamath County, Oreg., and for other purposes; and

H. R. 4000. An act to amend subsection 602 (f) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, to authorize renewals of level-premium-term insurance for successive 5-year periods.

On August 3, 1951:

H. R. 4329. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 303. Joint resolution to provide housing relief in the Missouri-Kansas-Oklahoma flood-disaster emergency.

On August 4, 1951:

H. R. 315. An act to liberalize the service pension laws relating to veterans of the war with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, or the Boxer Rebellion, and their dependents.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Landers, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 719. An act to establish beyond doubt that, under the Robinson-Patman Act, it is a complete defense to a charge of price discrimination for the seller to show that its price differential has been made in good faith to meet the equally low price of a competitor.

THE LATE HONORABLE CLIFTON WILSON

(Mr. LUCAS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, it grieves me to inform the House of the death of the late Judge James Clifton Wilson, a Member of Congress during the years 1917 to 1919, an honorable and distinguished predecessor of mine, representing the Twelfth Congressional District of Texas.

Judge Jim Wilson was one of the most beloved men who ever lived in my section of the State. His death has cast a pall of bereavement over our whole area.

Judge Wilson was born in Palo Pinto County, Tex., on June 21, 1874. He attended the public schools of Weatherford, Tex., and Weatherford College. He was graduated from the law department of the University of Texas in 1896, and admitted to the bar the same year, commencing his practice at Weatherford. He was assistant prosecuting attorney of Parker County from 1898 to 1900, and prosecuting attorney from 1902 to 1908. He was chairman of the Democratic county executive committee from 1908 to 1912, when he moved to Fort Worth to serve as assistant prosecuting attorney for Tarrant County. In 1913 he was appointed United States attorney for the Northern District of Texas, where he served until 1917. From thence he was elected to serve in the Congress of the United States, and served here during the Sixty-fifth and Sixty-sixth Congresses, where he established a reputation for himself as a staunch and able advocate of the cause of Woodrow Wilson in the House of Representatives.

In March 1919 he resigned from the House of Representatives to accept a place on the Federal bench, where he has served honorably and with distinction in the northern district of Texas as district judge. He was so deeply respected, so unswervingly fair, that I do not recall ever hearing a fellow lawyer say an unkind thing about him. He inspired confidence. He was, indeed, the exemplification of judicial dignity and honesty.

I know I bespeak the feeling of all Members of the House of Representa-

tives, and especially those who were here at the time he served, in expressing our grief to the family of Judge Wilson and to his many thousands of friends in that area of Texas over his passing.

HIROSHIMA

(Mr. HAYS of Arkansas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include there-with extraneous matter.)

[Mr. HAYS of Arkansas addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of today's RECORD.]

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

Mr. MAHON, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 5054) making appropriations for the National Security Council, the National Security Resources Board, and for military functions administered by the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH reserved all points of order on the bill.

CHALLENGE TO THE SOVIETS

(Mr. FLOOD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in order to continue further the advantage we now have in a propaganda warfare with the Soviets, I wish to use this forum this morning to again formally demand and to challenge the Soviet Government to prevent and to lift all of its jams of the facilities of the Voice of America and that for 1 hour, at a time to be agreed upon, the President of the United States be permitted to use the facilities of the Voice of America without jamming by the Soviet—for 1 hour for a message to the Russian people.

Apparently realizing that America and her free-world allies are, by sacrificial deeds, demonstrating that the democracies mean to meet aggression in every form and at every turn with resolute strength, the Kremlin has embarked upon one of its famous policy zig-zags in the form of a phony peace offensive.

In recent days, the Kremlin has made a number of moves designed to persuade the outside world that it has abandoned its design of world conquest and is disposed to be reasonable. There is a new propaganda magazine being published in Moscow. It has been brought to the front hastily to meet what the Politburo considers the need to lull the free world

to sleep; in the new propaganda offensive, the Kremlin has invited the west to cite its case. These abortive efforts have only resulted in garbled versions of the free world's position. It is too much to expect a full and honest reporting of the western position in the Soviet press. Instead, partial accounts are given of statements by democratic spokesmen and these are then used for further Soviet propaganda springboards.

I have a proposal to make. Let Stalin order a full cessation of the jamming of the Voice of America at a scheduled hour on a given day so that President Truman can talk directly to the Russian people. If there is a shred of honesty to Stalin's announced intention to put the democracies' case before his captive subjects, he will accept this challenge unhesitatingly. He must realize full well, however, that he does not come into "court" with clean hands, for Russian words have been belied by deeds all through the Stalin regime. I suppose there is little chance Stalin will accept this challenge when he refuses to publish the congressional resolution of friendship for the Russian people as transmitted by President Truman. It is well, however, to call the Kremlin's bluff in this instance, if only to expose its present phony peace efforts. It is noteworthy that in America nothing whatsoever is done to block out Radio Moscow.

CAMBRIDGE, NEBR., AIDS FLOOD-STRICKEN AREAS

(Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate and pay tribute to the town of Cambridge, Nebr. The newspapers report that Mayor Chancellor A. Phillips has sent in a contribution of \$6,004.50 for the people in the flood-stricken areas. This sum was raised by voluntary contributions in that town.

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note that Cambridge is not a large town. The population is about 1,340, yet this contribution exceeds the contribution made by many of our large metropolitan cities in the United States. The people of Cambridge are to be congratulated upon their generosity and public-spiritedness, and their understanding of human need.

The people of Cambridge know what devastating floods mean. Cambridge is located on the Republican River in Nebraska. This valley has had many devastating floods and I have on countless occasions taken this floor to speak on these flood losses. It was in 1935 that something over 110 lives were lost in the Republican Valley in Nebraska. In 1947, 17 residents of Cambridge lost their lives in floods.

Mr. Speaker, it is fitting that the Congress should know about the generosity of the people of Cambridge. This Congress has authorized and appropriated the money for a flood-control and water-conservation program in the Republican Valley. The Medicine Creek Dam, a few miles north of Cambridge has been completed by the Bureau of Reclamation. It makes the reoccurrence of

the 1947 flood an impossibility. The Bureau has likewise completed the Enders Dam which will add to the flood protection of that area, and the Trenton on-river Dam on the Republican River is now under construction. This is an important flood-control feature, too.

The people of Cambridge have expressed their gratitude in a most concrete and genuine fashion.

NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

(Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that section 601 of the National Housing Act will expire August 15, 1951. This section requires this emergency housing to be eliminated by June 1950. It prevents new tenants from taking occupancy after August 15 of this year.

When this section of the act was put in the bill, we did not know then that another emergency like Korea, or an intensive defense program would be resumed. In my opinion the act should now be amended to continue its operation, and I would propose the following amendment which I hope the Banking and Currency Committee will adopt:

SEC. 611. Notwithstanding any other provision of the law, the President is authorized to extend, for such period or periods as he shall specify, the time within which any action is required or permitted to be taken by the Administrator or others under the provisions of this title, or any contract entered into, pursuant to this title, upon any determination by him, after considering the needs of the National defense and the effect of such extension upon the general housing situation and the national economy; that such extension is in the public interest.

Mr. Speaker, many of these installations are substandard, and the city, county, and school board desire to take them over and continue them as a housing project. However, many of them can be used for 2 or 3 years, and in my opinion this should be done.

In the city of Grand Island, Nebr., where there is a veterans' hospital, and a shell-making project is operated, there is the Broadwell Courts; in Sidney, Nebr., where there is the Sioux ordnance plant, there is Ordville and Sioux Villa. While these courts are inside the city limits they are not considered as part of the cities. These projects are similar to many others, which, under the present law, should not be discontinued as of August 15 this year. The amendment suggested will permit the Administrator to continue their operation. He should have this authority only after conferring with the city and county authorities.

I trust the Congress will see fit to adopt this or some similar amendment in order to handle the housing situation in these defense areas.

CORRECTION OF RECORD

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, on page A4853 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for Wednesday, July 25, in an extension of my remarks the newspaper is referred to as the Baldwin Park (Calif.) Tribune.

I ask unanimous consent that this be corrected to read "Baldwin Park (Calif.) Bulletin."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

CORRECTION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and correct the remarks I made on August 2.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

STATE DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

(Mr. BROWNSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON] placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Thursday some information concerning what he called an error on my part, when in connection with the State Department appropriation bill, I discussed a trip to Paris taken recently by Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs and Mrs. Howland H. Sargeant. Mrs. Sargeant is Myrna Loy, former movie actress.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON] said Miss Loy's expenses were paid by her husband. I assumed that. What I did say in the House on July 24 was that Mr. Sargeant made the trip on June 7, 5 days after his marriage to Miss Loy, as chief of the United States delegation to the UNESCO meeting. This means his expenses were paid by American taxpayers as I pointed out. The gentleman from Georgia did not discuss this point.

Meanwhile, I have learned of another trip to Europe, at the expense of the taxpayers. Mrs. India Edwards, director of the women's division of the Democratic National Committee, took this journey. She was United States delegate to the fourth assembly of the World Health Organization, held in Geneva, Switzerland, May 7 to May 25.

The World Health Organization meeting to which Mrs. Edwards was a delegate is described as bringing together the world's top experts on health and medicine affecting the welfare of hundreds of millions of people. I thought that a delegate to such a meeting would have wide experience in the field of public health or medicine.

But, an examination of Mrs. Edwards' biography in the latest edition of Who's Who in America, does not indicate that she has such a background.

I am interested in effective world cooperation as is the gentleman from Georgia, but I am also interested in economical government, and I feel it is impractical to talk about saving billions of dollars unless every effort is made to cut out every unnecessary expenditure, no matter how small.

Mrs. Edwards' immediate superior, William M. Boyle, Jr., the Democratic national chairman, has been called on

Mr. BURDICK.

Mr. POTTER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan and to include a speech.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois and to include an editorial from the Quincy Herald-Whig.

Mr. AYRES and to include a statement.

Mr. HOEVEN and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. CRAWFORD and to include quotations.

Mr. EVINS and to include an article from the American Legion Magazine.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee and to include a sermon by Dr. Fifiend, of Los Angeles, Calif.

Mr. BROWNSON in two instances.

Mr. McCORMACK and to include copy of a resolution recently adopted by the Disabled American Veterans of Massachusetts.

Mr. JUDD in three instances and to include extraneous material.

Mr. BROOKS.

Mr. VAN ZANDT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin (at the request of Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin).

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts and to include extraneous matters dealing with the removal of veterans' facilities.

Mr. YORTY (at the request of Mr. PRIEST).

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 719. An act to establish beyond doubt that, under the Robinson-Patman Act, it is a complete defense to a charge of price discrimination for the seller to show that its price differential has been made in good faith to meet the equally low price of a competitor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mrs. BOSONE (at the request of Mr. MURDOCK), for week of August 6, on account of official business.

Mr. YORTY (at the request of Mr. ASPINALL), for week of August 6, on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 48 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, August 7, 1951, at 12 o'clock noon.

OATH OF OFFICE, MEMBERS AND DELEGATES

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in section 1757 of title III of the Revised Statutes of the United States and being as follows:

"I, A B, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God."

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by each of the following Members of the Eighty-second Congress, pursuant to Public Law 412 of the Eightieth Congress entitled "An act to amend section 30 of the Revised Statutes of the United States" (U. S. C., title 2, sec. 25), approved February 18, 1948: VERA BUCHANAN, Thirty-third District, Pennsylvania; ELIZABETH KEE, Fifth District, West Virginia.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

679. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the report on co-operation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease for the month of June 1951, pursuant to Public Law 8, Eightieth Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

680. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled, "A bill to authorize payment for transportation of dependents, baggage, and household goods and effects of certain officers of the naval service under certain conditions, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

681. A letter from the Comptroller of the Currency, transmitting the Annual Report of the Comptroller of the Currency for the year 1950, pursuant to section 333 of the United States Revised Statutes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

682. A letter from the Deputy Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a report of a violation of the Revised Statutes, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, subsection i (2); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

683. A letter from the Chairman, War Claims Commission, transmitting the third semiannual report of the War Claims Commission as of March 13, 1951, pursuant to section 9 of the War Claims Act of 1948 (Public Law 896, 80th Cong., approved July 3, 1948, as amended); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

684. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copies of legislation passed by the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands, the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, and the Municipal Council of St. Croix, pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States approved June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

685. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report of claims paid under the Federal Tort Claims Act as reenacted (28 U. S. C. 2671-2680), for the period July 1, 1950, to the end of the fiscal year June 30, 1951; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

686. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a report of claims paid by the Post Office Department under the provisions of the Federal Tort Claims Act during the fiscal year 1950-51, pursuant to section 404

of the act of Congress approved August 2, 1946, Public Law 601 (28 U. S. C. 2673); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

687. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a copy of an order of the Acting Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, dated October 20, 1950, authorizing the temporary admission into the United States, for shore leave purposes only, of alien seamen found to be excludable as persons within one of the classes enumerated in section 1 (2) of the act of October 16, 1918, as amended by section 22 of the Internal Security Act of 1950; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

688. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the Post Office Department to designate enlisted personnel of the Army of the United States, the United States Navy, the Air Force of the United States, the United States Marine Corps, and the United States Coast Guard as postal clerks and assistant postal clerks, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

689. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended, to repeal the provisions therein for additional subscriptions on behalf of the United States to the capital stock of the Federal land banks"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

690. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation to pay claims for damages, audited claims, and judgments rendered against the United States, as provided by various laws, in the amount of \$13,791,463.07, together with such amounts as may be necessary to pay indefinite interest and costs to cover increases in rates of exchange as may be necessary to pay claims in foreign currency (H. Doc. No. 218); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

691. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting revisions of proposed appropriations for the fiscal year 1952 involving an increase in the amount of \$23,625,000 for defense production activities (H. Doc. No. 219); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar as follows:

Mr. MAHON: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 5054. A bill making appropriations for the National Security Council, the National Security Resources Board, and for military functions administered by the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 790). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. H. R. 2574. A bill to amend section 304 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 and section 4 of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947; without amendment (Rept. No. 791). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. H. R. 3510. A bill to authorize and direct conveyance of a certain tract of land in the State of Florida to the St. Augustine Port, Waterway, and Beach Commission; with amendment (Rept. No. 792). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. H. R. 3585.

A bill to authorize and direct the Administrator of General Services to transfer to the Department of the Navy certain property located at Decatur, Ill.; without amendment (Rept. No. 793). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. H. R. 4259. A bill to authorize and direct the Administrator of General Services to transfer to the Department of the Air Force certain property in the State of Mississippi; without amendment (Rept. No. 794). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Banking and Currency. S. 349. An act to assist the provision of housing and community facilities and services required in connection with the national defense; with amendment (Rept. No. 795). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MAHON:

H. R. 5054. A bill making appropriations for the National Security Council, the National Security Resources Board, and for military functions administered by the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H. R. 5055. A bill to authorize the exchange of certain lands of the United States situated in Ontonagon County, Mich., for lands within the Ottawa National Forest, Mich., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HUNTER:

H. R. 5056. A bill prohibiting lithographing or engraving on envelopes sold by the Post Office Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 5057. A bill to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SECREST:

H. J. Res. 309. Joint resolution to direct the maintenance and operation of locks and dams on the Muskingum River; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CLEMENTE:

H. Res. 367. Resolution to create a Select Committee To Investigate National Boxing; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin:

H. Res. 368. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the expelling of cadets at West Point Military Academy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United

States relative to naming the dike around Lake Okeechobee in the State of Florida in honor of the Honorable John R. Beacham, past president of Florida State Senate; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, opposing any tax on the income from bonds or other securities of the respective States and their political subdivisions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. McKINNON:

H. R. 5058. A bill for the relief of Lt. Comdr. Joseph S. Weigand; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 5059. A bill for the relief of Constantine A. Markellis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOOD of Georgia:

H. R. 5060. A bill for the relief of Kan Chang Ahn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

374. The SPEAKER presented a petition of National Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, Philadelphia, Pa., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Federal aid to education, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

for other employees, thereby effecting an equalization.

The third is an increase in pay, which has already been recommended by House and Senate committees.

If those measures are adopted, and I think everyone in the House will agree they will be, instead of a \$5,000,000 increase in the item of "Postal operations" we will have an increase of closer to \$250,000,000. The Senate conferees were adamant on decreasing this item below the amount fixed by the Senate. Consequently, since we knew there was a probability that this item would be increased by \$250,000,000 before the end of the fiscal year, we saw no particular point in fighting over an increase of \$5,000,000 at this time.

That is a brief summary of the report you have before you.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from Virginia yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to my esteemed colleague the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I am in receipt of a personal telegram from Hon. Harry M. Durning, the collector of customs of the port of New York, and should like to make inquiry with regard to the action of the conference committee on the appropriation for the Bureau of Customs, and particularly insofar as that appropriation affects the customs service in the port of New York. Does the committee on conference propose that there shall be any reduction in personnel or any further continuance of unfilled positions or vacancies in the port of New York, the largest and greatest port in the world? Does the conference committee intend such?

Mr. GARY. Absolutely not. There has been an increase in the workload and in the volume of customs. We have had to take that into consideration. Last year the situation became so acute that the Bureau of Customs came before our subcommittee and asked for 202 additional employees which we allowed in a supplemental appropriation. In the regular bill we provided for those 202 employees and projected them over into this fiscal year. I want to be perfectly fair with the gentleman—they did ask for 109 additional employees over and above the 202. They were not allowed. But the customs last year received \$36,825,000; we allowed them this year \$37,500,000, which is an increase of \$675,000 over last year. That is the figure that our subcommittee recommended to the House in the original instance and which the House cut on the floor.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished and able gentleman yield further?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. I am advised that there are presently 134 vacancies at the port of New York, as follows: 30 inspectors, 63 port patrol officers, 13 laborers, and 28 in the clerical force, all of which must be filled immediately. I am pleased to have the assurance as a result of the remarks just made by the gentleman from Virginia that the Washington office of the Commissioner of Customs will not deplete to any extent the

present personnel, including vacancies, in the customs force at New York because the customs receipts at the port of New York for the fiscal year 1951 amounted to over \$329,000,000, an increase of over \$112,000,000 over the amount collected in fiscal year 1950, an increase of more than 50 percent, while the cost of collection amounted to only approximately 3 percent. I am indeed pleased that the action of the conference committee will not result in any reduction of this force in the port of New York which renders such a splendid service to the taxpayers and that the Acting Commissioner of Customs is instructed accordingly.

In view of the contraband situation alone it is absolutely essential so far as the customs service in the port of New York is concerned that inspector and port patrol vacancies be immediately filled as they are the first line of defense against narcotics surreptitiously entering the port. Further, I should like to point out, while the business with which the customs service in New York concerns itself is much greater than at any time in history, there are presently less personnel including the expected-to-be-filled vacancies, than there were in 1928-29.

(Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GARY. Our committee is thoroughly cognizant of the situation as it exists in the various ports of the country. The increased volume in imports has been very substantial and we have taken that into consideration in fixing the customs appropriations for next year. We think we have been very generous with the bureau.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD].

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am not very happy about some features of this report which comes before you without my signature and that of my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH], who replaced the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] as a conferee.

First, let me say, I have noted the remarks just made by our subcommittee's distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY], with reference to anticipated legislation affecting the Post Office Department and its operations. I do not understand it is the function of our committee to appropriate funds in this or any other bill on the basis of anticipated legislation. We are called upon only to implement through appropriated moneys that which is now law.

Frankly, I do not think we did well in yielding to the Senate in adding \$5,000,000 to the funds voted by this body for postal operations for the new fiscal year, more than 1 month of which has already expired. It will be recalled that when the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] presented his report to the House last March it contained a stinging indictment of the Post Office Department, charging it with inefficiency and dragging of feet in the in-

stallation of modern equipment. Shortly thereafter the Committee of the Whole adopted an amendment from the floor requiring an additional cut in this item of \$22,000,000. However, on the following day it was struck from the bill by a margin of two votes in a roll-call vote in the House. Later, in the Senate, a floor amendment calling for a \$36,000,000 cut in the item lost out by the narrow margin of two votes in a record vote. While I opposed and voted against the House amendment I do not think we should have upped the final House figure by the \$5,000,000 insisted upon by the Senate conferees.

We did another thing in this conference report to which I object most strenuously. It has to do with the funds for the Coast Guard Reserve. Two years ago, yes, before Korea—the other body pressed us to appropriate \$3,000,000 for this Reserve training. Last year the House agreed to go along to the extent of \$1,000,000 to start the program. The showing this year was impressive, particularly due to the obvious necessity of training reserves in port security work, and we allowed the full amount of \$2,000,000 requested by the Coast Guard. The Senate cut the amount down to \$1,500,000 and in the conference we compromised on a \$1,850,000 figure. I know how the guard feels about this cut, and I personally feel it is tampering with the security of our ports in this period of atom-bomb development.

We pinched pennies on the Coast Guard item while we yielded millions to the Post Office Department. I can understand the feelings of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], who is concerned about the customs appropriation. I feel we would have done well in this instance to have yielded to the Senate on their higher figure. I am well aware of the terrific backlog of work now facing Customs and its added duties in this time of danger.

(Mr. CANFIELD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 13, page 5, line 18, after the word "vehicles", insert "and in addition to the number of passenger motor vehicles provided for herein, the Bureau may use not to exceed 20 passenger motor vehicles acquired through seizure as provided for by law."

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13 and concur therein, with an amendment, which I have sent to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GARY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert "acquisition of the foregoing 300

passenger motor vehicles insofar as possible to be from automobiles seized in accordance with law, in lieu of purchase, and in addition, the Bureau of Internal Revenue may utilize not to exceed 20 passenger motor vehicles acquired through seizure as provided by law."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 34, page 21, line 16, insert: "Sec. 402. No part of the money appropriated by this act or of the funds made available for expenditure by the Export-Import Bank of Washington which is in excess of 75 percent of the amount required to pay the compensation of all persons the budget estimates for personal services heretofore submitted to the Congress for the fiscal year 1952 contemplated would be employed by the Treasury and Post Office Departments and the Export-Import Bank of Washington during such fiscal year in the performance of—

"(1) functions performed by a person designated as an information specialist, information and editorial specialist, publications and information coordinator, press relations officer or counsel, photographer, radio expert, television expert, motion-picture expert, or publicity expert, or designated by any similar title, or

"(2) functions performed by persons who assist persons performing the functions described in (1) in drafting, preparing, editing, typing, duplicating, or disseminating public information publications or releases, radio or television scripts, magazine articles, photographs, motion pictures, and similar material, shall be available to pay the compensation of persons performing the functions described in (1) or (2)."

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and concur therein.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion by the gentleman from Virginia.

The motion was agreed to.

By unanimous consent, a motion to reconsider the various votes by which the motions were agreed to was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5054) making appropriations for the National Security Council, the National Security Resources Board, and for military functions administered by the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, I would like to reach some understanding with respect to time for general debate. The ranking minority member of the committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], is absent due to illness, but I ask the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH], if it would be agreeable to proceed with general debate throughout the afternoon, the bill to be read for amendment tomorrow.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I understand the gentleman has no disposition to limit debate this afternoon.

Mr. MAHON. This is the largest appropriation bill of the year, and I think we should have unlimited debate; certainly, there will be no disposition on my part to limit the debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas, which means, as the Chair interprets it, that general debate shall continue throughout the afternoon, to be concluded today, the bill to be read for amendment tomorrow?

Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 5054, the Department of Defense appropriation bill, 1952, with Mr. KEOGH in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the consent agreement, general debate is to continue throughout the balance of the day. The time will be equally divided between the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

The gentleman from Texas is recognized.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 hour.

Mr. Chairman, we come today to the consideration of the largest appropriation bill for the year, a bill which proposes an appropriation in the sum of \$56,000,000,000 for the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and the Office of the Secretary of Defense for the current fiscal year. The members of our subcommittee have had rare opportunity to be on the floor of the House of Representatives in recent weeks, because almost constantly throughout the year we have been in hearings. The hearings on this bill lasted for 11 weeks. We had before us about 500 witnesses and the printed testimony—and about two-thirds of the testimony is printed—as you will observe, covers about three thousand five hundred pages, about three million words, if we want to get down to details. So it has been a very burdensome responsibility. Yet the job has been an interesting one. While there are others perhaps in the country who play rather fast and loose with the Nation's secrets, the members of this subcommittee pride themselves not upon getting their names in the paper with respect to military secrets but upon keeping their names out of the papers in matters involving the security of the United States. I do not know of seven men in the Government or in the world for that matter who have presented to them each year such a vast amount of information of a secret nature with respect to every facet of our military program as do the members of this subcommittee. I wish in this regard to pay tribute to the members of this subcommittee who toiled through long days on these hearings. The press was not

present. It is a difficult duty and there are no headlines for those who do the spadework on these appropriations. We ask no glory, we desire none. We only hope and pray that we may do a good, workmanlike job. I wish to pay public tribute to the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD], to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES], to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RILEY], to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] and to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER] for their untiring efforts and for the complete assurance which the country can have that all secrets which those gentlemen have, and there are many, will be guarded with great care.

During the occasions when I have had brief opportunity to be on the floor of the House of Representatives this year, I have been accosted by my friends and colleagues who would ask: "How are you coming along with the bill? For heaven's sake, can you not do something with those wanton wasters of manpower and money in the Pentagon? Is it not outrageous the way they are throwing away the resources and the substance of the country?"

Of course, they will say, too: "We are most anxious not to retard the defense effort, but we do want some economy in the Military Establishment."

It is my considered opinion that the average Member of the House of Representatives has just about lost faith in the Military Establishment; that is, from the standpoint of economy and efficiency, not from the standpoint of character and integrity. I say without equivocation that there are many people in the military service who are men of great ability, giving their lives and their energies in a very noble and splendid way to the military program and this country can well be proud of those men and of their efforts. Nevertheless, there is a widespread feeling in the Congress and in the country that generally speaking our military people are wanton wasters, bad planners and poor administrators in many fields.

Why should it be that there is so much distrust of the managerial capacity of our military officials? In the first place, there is a lot of truth in the accusation that there is waste, extravagance, and mismanagement—that there is need for more efficiency. There is no doubt about there being much truth in that conclusion. While I am willing to defend the Pentagon, when the Pentagon is right, I would not for one moment be willing to assume the role of yes man for anybody in any branch of the Government. We have a responsibility here to perform and we give credit where credit is due; we condemn where condemnation is due, and we do not condone waste and extravagance and bad management, but, rather, we seek to find it and initiate corrective measures.

Our efficient executive clerk, Mr. Robert Lambert, who works unceasingly year in and year out with the committee, has prepared a report. It has my name on it. I phrased some of the sentences and I worked on it, but the major

part of the credit for that report goes to the clerk of this committee. He did a magnificent job. That report is available to you. It is 158 pages in length, and if you want to know something about the bill, you can probably learn more about it by reading the report than by listening to me speak about the measure at this time.

There was a hue and cry in the press of the country and in the Congress, for that matter, when fighting in Korea started. We had a little shoestring force in the Far East in the beginning, not having planned to fight there, and this hue and cry arose from throughout the land. The question was asked: What has happened to the \$50,000,000,000 which we had appropriated during the last 4 years? Has it been completely dissipated? Well, that question was easy to answer, and the answers were afforded and appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. However, I doubt that the Members of the Congress and the people have had time and opportunity to thoroughly read and study what happened to that money.

With respect to the pending bill we have sought to make a more comprehensive report, and make it crystal clear to all as to what the Department of Defense proposes to do with the \$56,000,000,000 in this bill. The report tells where the money would go. That, I trust, will answer a need which I feel has not been adequately answered before, a requirement that the people be better informed about their Military Establishment. If the people lose faith in their Military Establishment, if the people lose faith in the Joint Chiefs of Staff, if the people lose faith in the Congress, if the people lose faith in themselves and the traditions of this country, democracy has lost and totalitarianism only has to enter in to possess the land. So, we must consider these things in their proper perspective, my friends.

EXAMPLES OF MISINFORMATION ABOUT THE MILITARY

Now, one of the things that has undermined the confidence of the Congress and the people in the Military Establishment, as I said, is the fact that they have made mistakes, and another thing is that they have been accused of making mistakes which they did not make. The press and the radio of the country have printed stories which are wholly and glaringly in error, and these stories have misled the people and the Members of Congress, and the people have felt a sense of outrage which they would not have felt in some instances had they known the facts. Well, now, let me hasten to say that I pick no quarrel with the press; please quote me on that. As to the members of the press, I love them all; they are wonderful and essential and I am 100 percent for the press and for freedom of the press. But if it is sometimes difficult for this committee, with all its power of the purse strings, to get the truth out of the Department, how can we expect people in the press sections to be able to get information which we sometimes find impossible to secure? So, in no way, I hasten to remind you,

do I criticize the press for carrying these erroneous and misleading stories.

Now, it seems rather ridiculous to talk about petty things when we have before us a \$56,000,000,000 bill, but I would like to begin this discussion by talking about can openers. I do not know how many Members of Congress have come to me with a look of indignation and horror in their faces and said, "GEORGE, did you know that the Quartermaster has bought 68,000,000 can openers?" And they were appalled and they wondered why such a thing had come to pass. And the press and the country has had a merry time talking about 68,000,000 can openers. The story has been rehashed from time to time from coast to coast. They said, "Of course, you cannot trust the military, because they bought 68,000,000 can openers." Good heavens. Well, it seemed to be the thought of these perfectly honest newspaper people that the can openers were of the type you probably would secure in a store for a couple of dollars each. So we summoned the Quartermaster and said, "Run quickly and bring us one of those can openers." Lo! He brought us a can opener about the size of a thumbnail. I have 300 of them here, and I hope that every Member will avail himself of a little souvenir in the form of one of these can openers.

Well, when a man goes forth in combat in Korea—and nobody knows when he will go back to combat there or elsewhere—he has a combat ration. He has about six cans a day; the ration varies. Here is the soldier and here is a can. Then the obvious problem arises, how will the soldier open the can and eat the food, and dodge the bullets of the enemy during that time?

It occurred to the Quartermaster that probably he should have a can opener—a kind of novel and revolutionary thought, probably. So 68,000,000 of these can openers were provided, and they cost a penny and a half each. Then somebody said, "but why 68,000,000 can openers for a military force of 3,500,000. Can openers are all right, and we like them, but why 68,000,000 of them?"

There have been about 600,000 people fighting in Korea, the Republic of Korea troops and Americans. Let us say we have 1,000,000 men in combat and they each get 6 cans a day and 1 penny and a half can opener. In 68 days of combat they would use 68,000,000 can openers. But 68 days is not a very long period in a war. I think the American people would ungrudgingly like the soldier to have the necessary can opener.

The committee is somewhat apologetic that maybe we have not provided enough can openers, but we make no apology for providing 68,000,000 can openers, which would last a million men at a million openers a day for 68 days of combat.

The cans are opened with these little penny and a half can openers. The openers have a little hole in them. A soldier can keep them for more than a day, but we do not worry too much about that. They need to be sterilized if used the second day. After all one in these days could hardly expect to buy an in-

destructible object for 1½ cents. If the soldier is willing to fight and die for the Stars and Stripes we are going to give him a can opener every day, whereas he might be able to get along with the same can opener for 2 or 3 days.

Some people say, "Why don't you put keys on those cans? Why buy those can openers?" The quartermaster said that we saved \$17,000 this year by not putting keys on them. If you put keys on them you have to use a different can, a better can. You get the key and you open this can, which I hold in my hand, but by the key method the can is opened below the top, and if you have liquid in the can some of it runs out and is wasted. The quartermaster said "The other can-opener is better and its costs less. Pray let us have our choice of can openers."

So that is the story of the can opener. The story is completely true, but by reason of misunderstanding it has rocked this country from the Pacific to the Atlantic and from the Mexican border to the Canadian woodlands.

Admiral Charlie Fox, Chief of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, the purchasing agent of the Navy, called me on the phone yesterday. He said, "Mr. Chairman, this is Admiral Charles 'Oyster Fork' Fox of the Navy." I said, "Hello, Admiral." And he is a grand man with a wonderful sense of humor and a fine record in the Navy. No, he did not buy the wartime oyster forks. He was serving on the historic *Enterprise* at the time. He was erroneously accused of the bad judgment which led to the procurement of certain wartime silverware. The Navy did waste about \$26,000 on these oyster forks during World War II the Navy admits that.

We discussed in our hearings the matter of these oyster forks. Of course, when the report came out in the papers, it was spread from one part of the country to the other. It was written up in this phraseology one week and next week a little different slant was given the story, and next month a different slant, and so on. It was really wonderful reading, and everybody was having fun with the Navy.

Somehow our hearing had progressed 2 days before it occurred to somebody to ask what these oyster forks had cost. Members who may be accustomed to buying silverware for the daughter of their best friend when she gets married probably thought the oyster forks cost \$2 to \$3 each. Finally somebody said, "Admiral, how much did the Navy pay for those horrible oyster forks?" The Admiral said, somewhat apologetically, "Eighteen and one-half cents each." He said, "The better ones which we buy cost 24 cents. They are the good ones." Of course, that lowered our blood pressure somewhat. But that is the story which went out to our constituents and which was repeated and which will still be repeated and circulated because it is not convenient to print retractions. There is nothing sensational about that. So the story was that the Navy had 11,000,000 oyster forks and the American people swallowed that story hook, line, and sinker. And you cannot blame

them. They had not been told any different. Unfortunately we have a tendency to believe what we read, a carry over from childhood.

They multiplied 11,000,000 by 12 and they figured out, 132,000,000 oyster forks for the Navy, consisting of a million men. Why you could have nearly everybody in America in the Navy going rushing forth to battle, not with the spear of the knight of old, but with an oyster fork. Of course, there was some truth in the story. The Navy did have in excess of 11,000 dozen oyster forks. Officials said, "When we have notable people aboard like foreign mayors and potentates we like to have proper silverware and we thought that maybe a 24½-cent or an 18-cent oyster fork was not too much to uphold the dignity of our magnificent Navy." They said, "We feel we have not been too extravagant." So I got my pencil and I figured out that this story about the 11,000,000 dozen oyster forks which rocked the country was one-tenth of 1 percent true. To put it a different way, it was 99⁹⁹/₁₀₀ percent untrue. But, of course, it did a great deal when added to a lot of other things to shake the confidence of the people in the Department of the Navy.

Another favorite libel upon the Navy is that while they had only about 10,000 WAVES, they had ordered 1,300,000 dresses for them. Being an adult and being somewhat familiar with the desires and inclinations of women, I thought perhaps that was right when I first heard the story. I thought "After all I suppose the WAVES want a considerable wardrobe." I do not know of any woman who does not. But I thought that maybe they did go a little far afield here buying 1,300,000 dresses for 10,000 WAVES and women Marines. So upon investigation, it was found they had ordered a few thousand of these dresses for the WAVES, 1 percent of that number had been ordered, I believe. I have the exact figure, but it slips my mind at the moment. In other words, there was some truth in the statement, you understand. It was not a complete misstatement. It was not the fault of the press. The press was confused because the Navy in figuring out mobilization requirements in case we went into an all-out war had called upon a company to say how many dresses they could make, and not to be timid about it, I think the company said they could make 1,300,000 dresses. So the story was to some extent true. It was 1 percent true—or to put it another way, it was 99 percent untrue.

The services do not have a perfect way of fighting back. They are supposed to listen in this civilian form of Government which we have, and not necessarily take the initiative in public controversies.

Hence I felt it would be proper to bring out into the open some of these things. There are many other misstatements. There are hundreds of them: I hasten to say I would not want these remarks to indicate that the military forces are perfect. They are far from perfect.

NEED FOR BETTER MANAGEMENT OF DEPARTMENT

In my opinion, the Military Establishment is not too well managed. In my

opinion, we need a better management from top to bottom. In my opinion, we need better utilization of manpower and money from the Pentagon all the way down to every installation and every activity in the Army, Navy, and the Air Force. If you will read the 3,500 pages of hearings, and the 158 pages in the report, you will find that in blunt language and without equivocation this committee acting as an instrument for the Congress sought to get at the roots of these difficulties which confront us, and we took the hide off the military officers wherever that seemed to be proper. Yet we recognized that the tasks of the military people during this mushroom build-up has been a tremendous one. We tried to get the facts in order, not to embarrass or humiliate anybody, but in order to get efficiency.

Someone said to me, "You cut the civilian personnel in this bill \$145,000,000, by about seventy or eighty thousand people. What if a war breaks out tomorrow, will Congress not be embarrassed?" No. If a general war breaks out tomorrow, it will be a fight for our existence, and we will have to marshal all our resources of manpower and money if we are to win that struggle with a minimum of effort and sacrifice. If there is any threat of an all-out war, the time to begin to economize and conserve in manpower and resources is now, because we are going to have to do it, if worst comes to the worst and we are thrown into a terrific struggle for existence with the Communist forces of the world.

Now, may we leave the penny and a half can openers and the 18½-cent oyster forks and go to bigger figures.

EXPENDITURE ESTIMATES, 1951 AND 1952

This pending bill provides for an appropriation of \$56,000,000,000 for defense, but this is not the first time the Congress in recent months has thought about this business of national defense. We provided a lot of money last year. Let us take a look at what we did in the fiscal year which ended June 30.

During the last fiscal year we provided \$48,000,000, but when the Department of Defense entered fiscal 1951 on June 30, 1950, they had on hand an unexpended balance of \$8,000,000,000. If you add 48 and 8, you have 56. So last year the Department of Defense had for expenditure \$56,000,000,000. It is rather a coincidence that this is precisely the amount of money provided in the current bill. But how much did the Department of Defense spend of the \$56,000,000,000 available for expenditure during the last fiscal year?

They spent out of this \$56,000,000,000 available a total of about nineteen or twenty billion. In other words, they brought into the current fiscal year about thirty-six or thirty-seven billion dollars unexpended, which the Congress had provided. Why did the Congress provide it? The Congress provided it in order that the Air Force and Army and Navy might use those funds to make contracts with aviation companies, ship builders, tank builders, and so forth—so that they could get under way with the program.

This bill provides for \$56,000,000,000. The Military Establishment officials estimate that during the current fiscal year they will spend about \$40,000,000,000. So if you take \$40,000,000,000 from \$56,000,000,000, you have \$16,000,000,000. If you add the \$16,000,000,000 onto the unexpended balance of last year, you have something in excess of fifty-three or fifty-four billion dollars which will not be expended at the end of the current fiscal year, but which will, by and large, be obligated. In other words, we spent for the military last year roughly \$20,000,000,000; we are going to spend twice that much this year. That is a pretty good indication of the tempo of our build-up.

COST OF KOREAN WAR

Now I should like to make some references to the cost of the Korean War.

We became involved in the Korean War in June of 1950. Truce talks are now in progress, but no cautious man would hazard a prediction as to just what may develop in Korea during the coming months.

When we consider the costs of the Korean War our thoughts instantly turn to the chief cost; that is, the American lives that have been sacrificed in this struggle. We think of those who have been killed, of those who are missing, of those who have been wounded and maimed. The costs have been very great, running to about 80,000 casualties.

It is somewhat difficult to estimate the money cost. Of course, we have had a terrific build-up in our preparedness program since June of 1950. We have increased the number of men in uniform and we have provided many billions of dollars for additional cost in our military build-up in considering the costs of Korea.

If Korea has been an instrument in awakening the American people to the perils with which we are confronted, and if Korea has caused us to get better prepared to wage a general war, and, more importantly, to perhaps prevent a major war, then certainly the sacrificing of lives and dollars in Korea may prevent much greater losses of lives and expenditures at some future time. We hope so.

The best estimate which I am able to compile, after making a study of the situation and conferring with defense officials, is that during the fiscal year which ended on June 30 the cost of the Korean War was about \$5,000,000,000. If the Korean War should continue throughout the current fiscal year the cost of the war—assuming that there would be no wide expansion of the fighting—would be \$4,500,000,000.

In estimating the cost of the Korean War to date we must consider a number of factors. There have been vast transportation costs. A part of the maritime fleet was taken out of mothballs and utilized. Commercial aircraft were called into the Government service. In other words, the transportation cost is large. The costs in ammunition have been large, and the extra costs in combat food rations, combat boots, and other clothing have been great. We must also take into consideration the loss of artillery, the loss and attrition on tanks, ar-

tillery, and various vehicles. We must also take into consideration the extra steaming time of the fleet and the extra activity of the Air Force. Of course, much of the aircraft used in Korea was obsolescent, and steps had already been taken to begin a systematic replacement program for the aircraft. In other words, it would hardly be proper to consider the cost of the aircraft, but the extra activity, fuel consumption, and ammunition utilized is certainly a proper charge against the Korean War.

I do not as yet have an authentic figure from the Department of Defense, but the estimates which I have given are based upon conferences with Defense officials and the information supplied during committee hearings.

This bill does not provide any money for making up deficits in ammunition stocks and reserves which have been brought about by these expenditures in Korea.

Now the question arises in view of these large figures: Where do we go from here?

WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE; THAT IS, AS TO MILITARY SPENDING AND APPROPRIATIONS?

The world picture should be somewhat clearer this fall. This fall is referred to as the time of decision. If, as I mentioned earlier, the Korean War is not settled and if it proceeds throughout the current fiscal year upon about the same basis as last year, an appropriation of about four and one-half or five billion dollars would be required late this year for the further financing of the Korean War.

If the Korean War is terminated, and if world tension continues at about the present pressure, there will still be a reexamination of the military situation late this year—regardless of developments, there will be this reexamination. A decision will be made as to whether or not we level off, increase slightly the military build-up or plan a precipitous build-up. In my opinion, additional funds will be required and will be requested late this calendar year or early next year for a further implementation of the Air Force and for a further build-up of the Navy air arm. In my opinion, and I hazard this prediction, if world tension does not somewhat subside, there will be an increase in our 3,500,000-man force.

I trust that there will be no let down in our defense build-up, and in the spirit of determination on the part of our people until we have become sufficiently strong to speak with more authority in the world and to exert the maximum force for peace.

We are not now strong enough to exert the maximum force for peace in the world; and the object of this bill is to make us stronger and make the Voice of America heard around the world with greater clarity—the kind of language that the men in the Kremlin have learned to respect and understand.

Developments in Korea are significant and important, but Korea is only one part of a much larger pattern, and we cannot change our policy with every wind that blows. Strength is absolutely essential if we are to be able to sit down

at the conference table and work out anything resembling a program for world stability and peace.

Unfortunately, we Americans, if we read an optimistic headline today, have a tendency to go jauntily on our way and say, "Let us quit all of this foolishness about national defense spending." We are inclined to do that. But I think I can say to the American people if they should happen to listen to my inadequate voice that the attitude of Congress is not to waver with every wind that blows, but to get stronger with every passing day and consider this thing as a long-pull proposition, continue to build up and refuse to be beguiled or misled by the mutterings and the utterings of the Kremlin.

Overwhelming passage of this unprecedented appropriation for national defense will strengthen our hand in truce negotiations in Korea. It will strengthen the hand of Admiral Joy, General Ridgway, and those who are working on this cease-fire proposition over in Korea. It is important that we appear before the world in our true light; that is, as a determined people. And when the roll is called on this bill—and I propose to request it—I think the world will be able to read clearly what the American people think with respect to this matter of national defense and the security of our country.

PROSPECTS OF GENERAL WAR

Now, what are the prospects for war? That is a very intriguing question. Nobody can draw back the curtain and peer into the future with anxious eyes and read what the future holds. If heaven would give us the vision to do it, we might double this bill, or we might do differently from the way we are doing. But what are the prospects of war? If war will not come for a decade, then our build-up could be more slowly. How fast should we proceed toward our objective? Well, of course, the basic reason for this appropriation and previous appropriations has been to deter aggression, to prevent war. This is not a war bill. This is a peace bill. That is the reason we provided for expenditure of \$48,000,000,000 last year and \$56,000,000,000 are provided in this bill. We are appropriating these fantastic sums to be stronger and to avert war, if possible; and, in the second place, we are providing the money with the hope that if a general war comes we can avert defeat and achieve ultimate victory. No American ever dreams but what it will be ultimate victory for this country if this general war comes. Those who cry about our shortcomings—I hope their voices are not heard in Moscow, because Moscow should understand that we are not a weak and flimsy-minded people, but that when we put our hands to the plow we plow to the end and accomplish our objective.

It becomes a very proper subject of inquiry whether or not our efforts will avert a major war. When top officials were before our committee they were asked to discuss the likelihood of a general war. Would there be a general war between the United States and Russia? If war should come between the United States and Russia, when should we an-

ticipate that such a war would begin? We asked many witnesses. All Members pondered that question, all Americans do. I shall insert in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks excerpts from the statements made by General Bradley, Secretary Marshall, and the late Admiral Forrest P. Sherman, to whose memory I pay tribute today as one of the most able American officers on the military scene in Washington in many years. I digress long enough to say that he did as much for the cause of unification in the military forces as anybody has done during this decade. He was a great American who is going to be missed more than some people fully realize.

Of course, I realize it would be presumptuous for me to hazard an opinion on this explosive subject, but one cannot work with military bills for a decade and be associated for months in each year with defense officials without forming some conclusion. I am absolutely convinced that there is no possible excuse for any degree of complacency on the part of the citizens of the United States. I am happy to say I do not think there is any such complacency on the part of the American people. In my judgment, there is only a minimum hope that our difficulties with Russia can and will be resolved short of war. I regret to form that conclusion. I form that conclusion not because of any lack of desire on our part for an amicable settlement of all the problems of our world. We leap at every opportunity to come to an agreement and settle things short of war. The Kremlin has not been receptive to amicable settlement, but as we get stronger and America's voice gets more mighty, I am hopeful that there will be a more conciliatory attitude in the countries which are governed by totalitarianism.

Trends from cold to hot war, from little wars to big wars, do not have a tendency to reverse themselves short of an all-out explosion. So, while we work for defense, seek to expedite the rearmament program and pray for world peace and a better understanding, we might as well face the tragic realities of the present situation. I agree with the military officials, whom I shall quote in a few moments, that war is not inevitable and I think that it would be a tragic mistake for us to discontinue our efforts toward a peaceful settlement of the differences which exist between the United States and Russia. No top official, insofar as I know, advocates a preventive war. What we want is peace. We are not so blind that we fail to realize that an all-out shooting war might last for a decade and might very well destroy much of civilization as we know it on this planet.

Those who flippantly talk about flying over some far-away land and tossing out an atomic bomb and coming home and saying, "The war is over," have not thought this thing through.

One cannot help but shudder at the contemplation of the death and misery that would be incident to a global conflict involving the United States and Russia as the principal adversaries. That is a major reason why we are trying to build up our strength.

Let us, therefore, accelerate our military build-up program and seek to become stronger in guns and planes and plans, and let us also seek to become stronger in the field of foreign policy, and, moreover, let us somehow seek to bring out the best in American character in order that we may be fortified mentally, spiritually, and physically for the testing days ahead.

If I speak with too much enthusiasm, I hope you will pardon me for being full of my subject. This is important business involving the very existence of our Nation.

There has been considerable discussion from time to time as to whether or not time is running for or against us—whether time is running for or against Russia. There is room for discussion on this point and the question is not without significance.

With every passing day we become stronger. We are increasing our weapons production, our training program, and atomic stockpile. On the other hand, who is so foolish to assume that the Communists are standing still? They, too, are increasing their state of readiness. Some argue that time is running against us because Russia is building up her stockpile of A-bombs and will eventually have sufficient bombs with which she might be capable of delivering a devastating surprise attack upon this country. Be that as it may, the truth is we are not going to begin a preventive war and we are going to faithfully seek in every proper way to postpone indefinitely the outbreak of a general war. After all, as long as such a war is not in progress there is some hope, however small, that it can be averted.

It is rather interesting to point out with respect to the question as to whether or not time is running in our favor that dictatorships such as the dictatorship of Mussolini, Hitler, and the dictators of old have carried with them in greater or lesser degree the seeds of their own destruction. In that sense, certainly time is running in favor of freedom and against tyranny and dictatorship.

After we had had our investigators working, and we do have a staff of investigators, and after we had conducted our hearings and looking into the budget requests fully, we found that all the money requested would not be expended or obligated, and that there was no need to provide it unless the money was needed; also, that because of readjustments in some of our military programs certain reductions and postponements could be made. So we made reductions in the Army, Navy, and Air Force requests. The report explains the details.

We cut Ordnance in the Army by something around \$300,000,000. They asked for \$8,600,000,000.

For reasons that are good and sound, in our judgment, we made reductions throughout the bill. We were trying to effect every saving and economy without injuring the defense effort.

The fact that these reductions were made to the extent of \$1,500,000,000 does not mean that Mr. SHEPPARD, Mr. SIKES, Mr. RILEY, Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. SCRIVNER, and I are completely satisfied with the program. It

does not mean that we want to slow down the program as fixed by the Department of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff. If we give additional funds for programs not yet planned and approved by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, we have found from experience, those funds will not be expended. So we gave the Military Establishment the funds which we felt were necessary for carrying out the program which the Joint Chiefs of Staff had planned and which they presented to us.

There are some of us who feel that we are moving too slowly, and that a more ambitious program is required, as I have previously indicated in these remarks, but our problem was not to determine how much further we should go at this time but whether or not the program outlined could be carried out with the funds which were requested. We made those reductions in the light of all the facts and circumstances.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MEADER. I do not believe there is any doubt that every Member of Congress favors a strong national defense at this time. I certainly want to put myself on record in that position. I think the Members of Congress, however, must in this case, perhaps more than others, rely on the subcommittee handling this particular appropriation. For that reason, may I ask the gentleman how large a staff he had and how long a period they worked? Are they temporary or do they work the year around?

Mr. MAHON. Of course we have the seven members of the committee who work in committee most every week, usually from 10 o'clock in the morning until 4 or 5 in the afternoon. That is in committee work. There are some things that nobody can do but you. In other words, the broad decisions and policies cannot be made by a staff.

I read an editorial this morning in one of the papers which stated that what Congress needs is a larger staff. I think we need larger staffs, but over in the Pentagon they have 31,000 people, they have a lot of staff, but there is a lot of snafu and confusion. Staff is not the whole answer.

This piling Pelion upon Ossa, getting more and more personnel, does not necessarily mean more efficiency. We could go out and hire hundreds of people, but you might have more confusion and more waste and less economy. So we go through the hearings, we go through the bill line by line, we go through mountains of justifications running into thousands of items. We have a couple of our men who sit at our side in the committee room. We had about a dozen investigators who spent a couple of months working in connection with this bill. They suggested certain things to us. They made a voluminous confidential report to the committee that enabled us to go deeper into certain things. We have availed ourselves of testimony developed by the committee of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER] and by subcommittees of the com-

mittee of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], and even committees of the Senate. We availed ourselves of all the information we could get.

We are building up a staff, but we do not want people in our way. We want people who can be useful to us. If Congress were not so continually in session we could have more time to go out and look about. We do get around, and we do not apologize for the public money which we spend on that. We apologize because we do not get out into the field more. If we could hurry up and adjourn, we would better be able to see what is being done with these billions of dollars. That is about the best answer that I can give. We do not have an ideal staff. We are recruiting men. We are recruiting people this month.

Let me say this: The best way to achieve economy is not necessarily through cuts. We can prod and we can slash and we can use the meat ax. Sometimes the meat ax shocks people to their senses, and it is not altogether out of place in a legislative body. But the real place to get efficiency is in the Military Establishment itself. The people who run the show from top to bottom know where the weaknesses are. They know where money and personnel is being wasted, and they are the people upon whom we are trying to heap coals of fire in order to inspire them to better performance.

That reminds me—I want to speak critically of some of the performances of the Ordnance Department of the Army before I take my seat because they failed to present a forthright statement to the committee with respect to certain information which was requested. Yet I do not believe the mistake was willfully made. I repeat we need better management and better people and more efficiency from top to bottom. While we in Congress want to do what we can, you know that the people in any particular office should know how to run it better than anybody else. This is true with the Pentagon, and we are seeking the double-barreled approach, if I may say so.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. MEADER. Is the committee and the staff allowed access to classified information?

Mr. MAHON. By all means, the members of this subcommittee have more classified information thrown at them in the course of weeks than one could print in several issues of a metropolitan newspaper. Yes, we have access to innumerable bits of classified information. In other words, money talks. When people come from the Pentagon, we insist on the answers, and we usually get them although sometimes we fail.

Mr. MEADER. I commend the gentleman for the attitude that he has displayed. With reference to the staff situation, I want to say I am a strong believer in competent, able, and sizable staffs for committees of Congress because, in my judgment, that is the only way, with the limited time Members of Congress have, that we can get into the

details of subjects such as this, dealing with a \$56,000,000,000 appropriation. It takes quite a few man-hours to get the details.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. BECKWORTH. The gentleman is making a very helpful statement for the membership of the House. I commend the gentleman on what he has said. On the subject of economy, we are all aware of the fact that there is no word that is found more often in the letters which come to each of us than the word "economy."

Mr. MAHON. That is right.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Naturally, since the gentleman is in charge of such a huge bill dollar-wise, he certainly has the same interest that we all have. The gentleman has mentioned that efficiency must be brought about by those who are running a given establishment.

Mr. MAHON. That is right.

Mr. BECKWORTH. The gentleman mentioned the Pentagon. Often we see reports which are issued from time to time which purport to be evidence that there is a great deal of inefficiency. As the gentleman has heard this testimony during the last few months, how much real information has he seen himself as to the extent of inefficiency in the Department of Defense of this Government?

Mr. MAHON. I mentioned the Ordnance Department. At the Detroit district office they are buying two-thirds of all this Army hardware. As I said, they had a commanding general there at the arsenal who seemed to have a conflict of loyalty between the Government on whose payroll he was and his own private interests.

In Detroit Ordnance bought some grills for tractors. Some official bought grills one month for about \$24 each. The very next month at this Ordnance district procurement office in Detroit the Government bought some more grills, 40 of them, and paid \$59.78 each for the identical grill which had been bought the month before for \$24. It was only a waste of about \$1,000; but my point has been, and the hearings will reveal it, that we fool around with chicken feed probably too much, whereas about \$30,000,000,000 in this bill will go for procurement. If we had better procurement practices, if we could save 1 percent on \$30,000,000,000, just 1 percent on these aircrafts and tanks and ships, we could save \$300,000,000. We have had industrialists before our committee and we have done what we could to get somewhere with this problem, and we shall continue to do so. I do not accuse our procurement officers of duplicity and fraud. Generally speaking, they are honorable, upright Americans, but somehow they have not been able to grasp this big program and carry it forward with the speed and economy that is required. That is the reason we have put some strong strictures in this bill, in order to help further the interests of the American people; and this is the interest of the military as well.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. I have listened to the gentleman very carefully. I assume that what your committee considered for the security of the Nation by way of secret information, is not included in the 3,500 pages of hearings before your committee.

Mr. MAHON. If we had printed that, there would have been perhaps another couple of thousand pages.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I notice in the committee report, on the first page, the committee points out that there is an item of \$4,500,000,000 that will come up later for public works.

Mr. MAHON. Yes. That will come later. It is before the Armed Services Committee of the Senate now, and we have got to go through the drudgery of those hearings later.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That will carry the total, then, in excess of \$60,000,000,000.

Mr. McMAHON. In excess of sixty billion.

Mr. CRAWFORD. May I ask the gentleman something that he may not want to answer, but, as I understand, there is an additional \$8,500,000,000 for foreign aid coming up shortly, which more or less ties into defense.

Mr. MAHON. If it does not, it ought not to be before the Congress.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Then that will take us up to about \$69,000,000,000. Does the gentleman agree with that figure, roughly?

Mr. MAHON. Well, I think that is the figure which has been submitted, yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Does the gentleman know of any other large item which we may have in mind as we consider the consequences of this bill?

Mr. MAHON. Well, we have got money in other bills for the Maritime Commission, the Coast Guard; we have money in other bills for atomic energy, over a billion dollars. This is just a part of the national defense program.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Would it be conservative to say, then, that the total items will probably approximate \$75,000,000,000?

Mr. MAHON. Appropriationwise, yes; but the defense spending, insofar as the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force is concerned, is estimated this year to be about \$40,000,000,000.

Mr. CRAWFORD. May I ask the gentleman another question on this thought: It is hammered into us almost constantly that Congress might not stand hitched. Where does the inspiration come from that the Members of this House are not going to stand hitched on defense? We hear it on almost every radio broadcast. The distinguished gentleman who has just addressed us has just cautioned us not to sit down on the job. Who is it who is attempting to sit down in the Congress of the United States? Who in the Congress of the United States is talking about cutting defense appropriations?

Mr. MAHON. Well, we are talking about cutting them, and we are cutting them some here in the interest of efficiency.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I mean cutting the essential items. I have not heard a single Member stand up at any time and talk about cutting the essential items. Yet members of the administration are constantly hammering at the country that if you do not watch out the Congress is going to sit down on them. Where does that come from?

Mr. MAHON. I do not think there is any desire to lambast Congress in this defense matter. I think we try to reflect the wishes of the people, but I think it is necessary for us in Congress to be on the alert, and I think Congress is on the alert. In my judgment, the Congress is undertaking to make a real contribution to this tremendous task, on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I wish to compliment the gentleman from Texas for the informative and eloquent talk he has given us. I am particularly interested in the point he makes about procurement and the advisability of looking into that. Are any practical steps being taken whereby the Congress or the committee can have a sort of continuing look at the procurement activities of the Armed Forces?

Mr. MAHON. Various committees of the Congress, including this one, have been very zealous in that matter and are constantly looking into these things. It is not one big day in the House and that is all for the year; it is something that goes on constantly throughout the year.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Who is supervising it?

Mr. MAHON. There is a lot of money in the bill for inspectors who will inspect the material when it is received at the depots in the hope that we will get our money's worth. It is a very complex task.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. YATES. Just recently in the city of Chicago several hospital buildings have been completed. They cannot open in their entirety because of inability to get a sufficient number of nurses. Most of the nurses in the metropolitan area have enlisted in the Army, Navy, and Air Force. Is there any money in this bill to provide for the training of nurses such as was done during the Second World War? Is there a nursing program?

Mr. MAHON. Frankly, I do not have all of the details on that subject at the tip of my fingers. We did provide what was necessary for hospital employees and for nurses and so forth for the Armed Forces. Of course, it is difficult to recruit this type of personnel.

Mr. Chairman, I now insert quotations from the committee hearings by Secretary Marshall, General Bradley, and Admiral Sherman:

Mr. MAHON. Against that background of remarks which I think represents generally

the thinking of the members of the committee, we would like for you just to tell us what you think of the present situation.

Secretary MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, in the first place, I see no reduction. I might say this, and I think it is quite possible that when the final determination is made—the final decision, in October—that we will possibly be involved in approaching the Congress for certain increases, particularly for 1953 and 1954.

LIKELIHOOD OF ALL-OUT WAR

Mr. MAHON. Let me go to a much broader picture and then bring my interrogation to a conclusion. What is your considered judgment, General, as to the likelihood of a major war now as compared to 2 or 3 months ago?

Secretary MARSHALL. I would say that it is just about the same as 2 or 3 months ago. There has been a constant build-up in the Soviets and their satellites, of their military strength. Unfortunately we do not know a great deal about it.

Mr. MAHON. The likelihood of an all-out war is still an ever-present consideration?

Secretary MARSHALL. I think it is continuing and, from the viewpoint of the enemy's build-up, it is increasing.

PROCUREMENT LEVELS

Mr. MAHON. Would it be safe for us to reduce the level of procurement? Not that the items would not eventually be delivered, but could we reduce the rate of the build-up? Just for illustrative purposes, I have made reference to Army Ordnance requesting more than \$8,000,000,000. We could make reference to similar items in the Navy or to items in the Air Force. My point is this: Could we slow down on this huge procurement program safely?

General BRADLEY. Well, Mr. Chairman, I do not feel qualified to discuss in detail whether or not any of that particular program can be delayed, because that is outside my province.

Mr. MAHON. Yes.

General BRADLEY. But I would like to say this in answer to it in general: Most of those items or a lot of those items, are very long lead-time items, or at least your expensive ones are; and you will not be getting them until possibly late 1952 or 1953 and some of them in 1954. In my opinion those are the dangerous years.

TIME RUNNING IN FAVOR OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. TABER. General, do you figure that time is running in our favor or in favor of Russia at the moment?

General BRADLEY. I think it is running in our favor at the present time and that it will continue to run in our favor for a couple of years, at least.

DISCUSSION OF WORLD CONDITIONS

Mr. MAHON. Admiral Sherman, as Chief of Naval Operations and as a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, it is your responsibility to know something about world conditions and possibilities and probabilities. You have come in here with the weight of your very high position and requested an appropriation of \$15,000,000,000 for the Navy for the fiscal year which will begin in a few weeks.

In view of all those facts, it is not an improper inquiry to ask what the world picture looks like to you. Will you give us a statement in response to that observation, on or off the record?

Admiral SHERMAN. I will make it on the record with an opportunity to sanitize my remarks.

At the present time the situation is, in my opinion, more critical than it has been since the end of the last war. In the years 1946 to 1949, we experienced a series of crises, but during those years conditions in the Mediterranean countries were im-

proved; the aggression in Greece was terminated; great improvement was made in the stability and security of Western Europe by the agreement to establish the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, but also during 1949 two events took place which caused a great deal of concern. One was the atomic explosion in Russia and the other was the establishment of almost complete Communist control over China. We are now witnessing an attempt to extend the area of Communist domination in eastern Asia, which certainly threatens the security of the United States.

MIDDLE EAST SITUATION

The situation in the Middle East, particularly in Iran, is one to cause considerable concern. The extent to which we are committed to fighting in the Far East reduces our ability to wage war elsewhere if we should have to, so we have a picture in which there is an increase in our global risks, and an increase in the danger to the Nation.

KOREA

Since the beginning of the fighting in Korea we have managed to increase our forces and to increase our strength in other areas, as well as to carry on operations in Korea. In my opinion, as the expansion of our strength continues under the program which was initiated last December, our security is somewhat enhanced, but I would be less than frank if I did not tell the committee that I think the country faces great danger; that the free world faces great dangers, and will continue to do so until we achieve a position of military posture and military strength sufficient more effectively to defer aggression than our strength has so far.

POSSIBILITY OF AN ALL-OUT WAR

Mr. MAHON. People ask Members of Congress every day, and perhaps the military men—"Do you think that general war is inevitable?" When I go to my district and yield for questions at meetings, that is one of the questions asked me. Can I ask it of you? Do you think an all-out global war is inevitable?

Admiral SHERMAN. No; I do not think an all-out global war—what we call a world war—is inevitable. I think it is entirely possible that the future may hold a good deal of war, possibly smaller wars occurring more often. I do not think that war in itself has to be inevitable, but it is probable. I am speaking now of war as a generality. I believe that we have a good prospect of avoiding a full, all-out, world-wide war, but to do so will require strength and patience.

Mr. MAHON. The naval program and the preparation efforts of the country at this time are those things associated with this hope that you have?

Admiral SHERMAN. As I see it, it is our duty to do the best we can to handle our current problems, and at the same time provide a base from which we can mobilize to meet the demand of a general war if it should come. We cannot afford to base our mobilization plans on anything less than a general war.

ACTION TO AVOID ALL-OUT WAR

Mr. MAHON. What is the best hope of averting a general war?

Admiral SHERMAN. That is a question of broad policy. In my opinion, the best hope of avoiding a general war lies in a combination of several courses of action: One is to be sufficiently strong to deter our possible enemies from starting a general war. Another very necessary course of action, it seems to me, is to have alliances which are strong enough, sufficiently well-tested, and composed of allies who are sufficiently determined to act in unison to deal with instances of aggression, such as the one in Korea, more promptly and more effectively.

Mr. MAHON. Against that kind of background are we taking necessary steps to pre-

pare ourselves for the possibilities of a general war?

Admiral SHERMAN. We are engaged in a program, as I see it, which is designed to improve our state of readiness and build up to a level which we can sustain.

Now, if general war comes, of course we can accelerate it. We can build up to higher levels.

On the other hand, if we believe, as I do, that we are facing an opponent who does not want a general war now, but who wants to do everything possible to exhaust us, to drain off our energies in a small operation here and a small operation there, induce us to do things that will impair our economy, then we have to face the fact we are in an operation which may become an endurance contest; therefore, it is wise to achieve the level of military strength which we can sustain over a period of years. The worst thing that could happen to us, as I see it, would be to go to a full-out mobilization and not have a fight and then go into a period of cut-back trying to save money and pay our debts, and then suddenly find ourselves in a fight.

Mr. Chairman, I thank you for your generous attention and yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas has consumed 59 minutes.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman. I yield myself 60 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, at the outset I want to express my regret that the ranking member of the subcommittee and of the full committee, our good friend and co-worker the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], is unable to be with us today. It is just possible he may be with us tomorrow during the reading of the bill for amendment. As we all know, he has been recovering from an attack of pneumonia. I know that we are all happy that he seems to be well on the road to recovery.

Also, I want to express the satisfaction which I have found in serving on this subcommittee and to thank the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES], the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RILEY], the majority members of the subcommittee for the consideration which the minority members have received at all times.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before us today is one of the largest single appropriation bills ever placed before the Congress. Its size really staggers the imagination. The sum of \$56,000,000,000 is almost beyond comprehension. I think it is probably easier for the average person to grasp the vastness of the universe than to picture this astronomical sum.

The bill is a tremendously important one.

The Congress and the country today are faced with the problem on the one hand of national defense, and on the other hand of national solvency. We are at a point in our history where excessive expenditure could tip the scales toward national bankruptcy and disastrous inflation.

Expenditure essential to military power must be made as rapidly as practical. Nonessential expenditure, waste and extravagance embodied in these estimates or in any other estimates must be eliminated.

As I stand here today, Mr. Chairman, I cannot help thinking that able, courageous and honest leadership in America in recent years would have made this enormous bill unnecessary.

This \$56,000,000,000 appropriation bill represents a down payment on tragic errors in judgment made at the conference tables of Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam.

It amounts to a ransom for an appeasement policy which this administration has pursued in Asia, making it possible for the Chinese Reds to take over China.

It is a mortgage on the life of every American for blunders which made it possible for the Communist Government of Russia to extend its domination from 170,000,000 people in 1945 to 800,000,000 people by 1950, and this despite the fact that those 5 years were so-called years of peace.

And, Mr. Chairman, it does not include a nickel to finance the war in Korea in the present fiscal year.

It was the lack of essential leadership abroad, and the acceptance of political expediency that has left us today inadequately prepared in the face of the armed might of the Communist Government of Soviet Russia.

It was the lack of that leadership at home, and the willingness to accept political expediency that has left us today confronted by mounting prices, crushing taxes, dwindling savings, and the threat of insolvency.

Never before, Mr. Chairman, has a powerful, solvent America been more vital, not only to ourselves, but to all the free nations of the world.

It is not too much to say that the future of the entire western world depends on the power which we can develop and maintain here in America.

We must ask ourselves if we can reach the real root of our trouble by voting billions of dollars for armament.

We must ask ourselves if we are not attempting to substitute billions for leadership; bullets for statesmanship.

France once built a Maginot line. It was impregnable. France assembled one of the greatest peacetime armies in history. It was invincible.

But French leadership was bankrupt. Morale and morals degenerated correspondingly.

And in 1940 the world learned that no armed force, no fortress, no Maginot line ever built, could survive the fatal internal weakness of inept, corrupt, and vacillating leadership.

America needs more than a long-range military program. America needs leadership at the national level—leadership that is courageous, leadership that is farseeing, leadership that has integrity and is guided by moral principle.

DIFFICULTIES IN HANDLING BILL

Now, Mr. Chairman, in the handling of this bill your committee has been confronted by very great difficulties.

Budget estimates were not received from the President until the last day of April, despite the requirement of law that they be submitted during the first 15 days of the session.

Here on the table to my right on the majority side you will see a stack of papers which constitute the justifica-

tions originally submitted to your committee for over \$60,000,000,000 by the military. Those justifications, if piled on top of each other, would extend, I should judge, some 24 inches upward from the table. On the minority table you will see the committee print, the bill in work-sheet form, some 3 inches thick, and on top of it some four volumes of committee hearings developed in connection with this bill.

Those justifications, as I have said, represent over \$60,000,000,000 for the military alone, and just to give you a measuring stick, the money called for by these justifications alone is twice the entire cost of Government from the day of its founding in 1789 until the outbreak of World War I in 1917.

The cost of Government from 1789 until 1917 was \$29,520,000,000. The sum of money requested by the military and approved by the Bureau of the Budget and the White House, for the next fiscal year, embodied in these justifications, is over \$60,000,000,000, or more than twice as much.

Mr. Chairman, the justifications when received were, for the most part, based on the so-called performance budget. That is a new system. Judging by experience to date, the performance budget tends to consolidate rather than to break down; tends to conceal rather than to disclose; tends to eliminate essential detailed statements as to personnel and tends to make legislative control by the Congress more difficult rather than less difficult.

Whatever the departments and agencies may do from an administrative standpoint in this connection, it is imperative that the Committees on Appropriations of the House and of the Senate be supplied with essential detail.

The testimony submitted, Mr. Chairman, was also in many cases highly unsatisfactory. Time and time again no break-down was available; fundamental information was not forthcoming.

Time and time again we were told in effect "This figure represents our best estimate in the light of experience of the Department's needs for the fiscal year 1952." Witnesses were either unprepared or unwilling to supply simple and essential facts.

Again and again came the response, "We shall have to submit that later for the record."

Differing sets of figures were given by different witnesses in respect to the same question.

Literally hours of the committee's time were needlessly wasted in trying to extract by cross-examination information which should have been readily available.

I quote a typical exchange with a bureau chief with respect to a request for \$1,350,000:

MR. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I just want to observe that all we are told in this connection is that the funds estimated for this purpose in 1952 are to satisfy the requirements for additional equipment and to provide for the increased quantity of supplies needed in 1952.

I would like to ask the admiral, if he were sitting on this side of the table, on the basis of that statement, how he would determine

whether you need \$1,350,000 or \$500,000 or \$5,000,000?

Admiral ——. Sir, I would be at a loss.

The truth is, Mr. Chairman, that your committee and the Congress have been asked in many instances to proceed in the dark. We have been given some tables, some unsatisfactory testimony, some warnings, and are asked to vote the money.

NEED FOR INVESTIGATING STAFF

Your committee has had to consider some 24 volumes of justifications. It presents some 3,500 pages of printed hearings and a report some 158 pages in length, after 11 solid weeks of consideration.

I submit that no committee within the time available in the light of the justifications and testimony given could hope to obtain in and of itself the grasp of the situation which is essential to intelligent, comprehensive action.

What is needed, in my judgment, is an adequate staff of investigators, who are responsible solely to the Appropriations Committee and to the Congress, who have authority to go into the departments and agencies concerned, and who are on the job 12 months of the year.

Under the famous La Follette-Monroney Reorganization Act passed by the Seventy-ninth Congress, the committees of the Senate and House were supposed to be staffed with experts who could do the tremendous investigation and research work required to keep the membership informed in instances just like the one we face now.

MR. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

THE CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

MR. BENDER. I withdraw the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. WIGGLESWORTH. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] saw fit as chairman of the Appropriations Committee during the Eightieth Congress to set up such a staff of experts. That staff, as the membership will recall, was completely decimated when the chairmanship changed hands with the election of the Democrat-controlled Eighty-first Congress.

The Committee on Appropriations charged with considering billions upon billions of dollars of appropriations annually is, today, without a proper staff of experts, in clear violation of the spirit of that act.

I renew the appeal which I have made so often in the past for a staff of this character which is vital, in my opinion, under present conditions.

MR. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

MR. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

MR. CANFIELD. I think the gentleman from Massachusetts has just issued a challenge which must be met by the Congress if we are going to save funds in this appropriation. History has proved that the military are notorious spenders and after every build-up of a military establishment, certainly after every war, there have been shocking scandals of profligate and wanton spending. It is my firm belief—and I know it is shared by many of the Members of

Congress, and certainly by people on the outside—that if we do not have a constant watch-dog operation affecting the spending of these billions of dollars, we are going to have other scandals in the days to come. I hope the members of the committee will heed these words just uttered by the ranking minority member of this subcommittee. I think the subcommittee should have staff representatives working day and night in the Pentagon and throughout our Military Establishment. I believe that billions of dollars can be saved in this very appropriation. But that money will not be saved unless we have experts on the job watching the daily and nightly spending of these funds. I hope this challenge will be accepted. It will be a wholesome job in the best interests of the Military Establishment itself as well as the taxpayers of the country. The gentleman from Massachusetts has put his finger on the real problem and he points the way to tremendous savings and the avoidance of scandals.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I thank the gentleman. I appreciate his support.

BUDGET BUREAU

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS. While I am not a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I am a member on the Committee on Ways and Means. We have a terrific task to get the money. There is one department of the Government which, I think, ought to cooperate with the Committee on Appropriations much more easily than it does, and that is the Bureau of the Budget. My experience has been that the Bureau of the Budget has fast become the right arm of the Executive, of the President himself.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. JENKINS. The Bureau of the Budget ought to cooperate with the Committee on Appropriations to the very limit, and lay aside all political considerations, because just as sure as you live we have come to the point where we cannot raise any more money. We have just taxed ourselves to death.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I agree with the gentleman that the committee and the Congress should have the wholehearted cooperation of the Budget Bureau.

I think in recent years the Bureau of the Budget has become largely the mouthpiece of the Executive. What the Executive desires the Bureau of the Budget supports; what the Executive does not desire the Bureau of the Budget opposes.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. In the light of the requirements insofar as staff is concerned, what can be done in a practical way at the earliest opportunity to accomplish this improvement? What can be done, and who can do it?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I think that under the Reorganization Act the Committee on Appropriations as a whole has the authority to appoint such staff as it sees fit for this purpose.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Then the action should be by the majority of the committee. Is that correct?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I think that would be sufficient.

TOTALS

Mr. Chairman, I want to go a little more into detail.

It has been pointed out that the authority to incur new obligations which we now call appropriations, which was requested in this bill, amounted to \$56,100,000,000. If we add to that the further sum of \$4,500,000,000 for public works soon to be considered, it brings the total up to \$60,600,000,000. If we add to that about \$1,500,000,000 which is carried for the purpose of liquidating prior obligations or for certain special accounts which are appropriated for automatically, we get an over-all total of about \$62,100,000,000.

Eliminating for the moment the \$4,500,000,000 for public works and the \$1,500,000,000 by which the committee has ostensibly reduced the budget estimates, leaves a total of \$56,000,000,000 recommended for approval, as compared to \$48,000,000,000 in the last fiscal year.

In terms of expenditure, it is estimated that we shall require about \$39,500,000,000 as compared with \$19,500,000,000 in the last fiscal year; and as compared with about \$50,000,000,000, which Mr. Wilson, as head of the Office of Defense Mobilization, foresees as an expenditure figure for fiscal 1953.

As the chairman has pointed out, the appropriations recommended contemplate a carry-over into the next fiscal year of \$57,500,000,000 as compared with a carry-over into the present fiscal year of \$36,500,000,000.

I want to emphasize in passing that the \$56,000,000,000 now under active consideration includes nothing for the public works program. It includes nothing for financing the war in Korea after July 1, 1951. It includes nothing for the expense of the partial pay-as-you-go program which we have embarked upon in Japan. It includes nothing for inflationary price increases. It includes nothing for what may be recommended to the committee some months later at the conclusion of what is termed "the period of decision."

THE PROGRAM

The program as a whole contemplates about 3,500,000 people in the Regular forces of the three armed services; about 2,000,000 people in the National Guard, Reserve, and ROTC programs; an Army of about 1,550,000, with 18 divisions, and separate combat and supporting units; a Navy of about 805,000, with 1,162 ships; a Marine Corps of about 175,000, with 2½ divisions; and an Air Force of about 1,061,000 working toward a goal of 95 wings.

I should add that if civilian personnel requests had been allowed in full, the three services would have had a total civilian personnel of about 1,506,000—621,821 in the Army, 562,969 in the Navy, and 319,547 in the Air Force.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert at this point in the RECORD a table breaking down the over-all total of \$60,600,000,000, including \$4,500,000,000 for public works, by functions, for the Army, for the Navy, for the Air Force, and for the Office of Secretary of Defense:

Department of Defense—New obligatory authority by cost category, fiscal year 1952

[Thousands of dollars]

Cost category	Army	Navy	Air Force	OSD	Total
I. Military personnel costs	4,331,060	3,073,291	3,071,458		10,475,809
(a) Pay and allowances	3,240,080	2,412,230	2,393,801		8,046,111
(b) Subsistence	569,488	382,980	310,493		1,262,961
(c) Individual clothing	292,351	140,776	138,167		571,294
(d) Transportation, permanent change of station	199,453	130,076	150,947		480,476
(e) Other military personnel activities	29,688	7,229	78,050		114,967
II. Operation and maintenance	5,352,549	3,488,416	3,423,435		12,264,400
(a) Troops and facilities (Army and Marine Corps)	2,116,188	249,964			2,366,152
(b) Aircraft and facilities	7,422	599,767	2,654,431		3,261,620
(c) Ships and facilities		1,029,958			1,029,958
(d) Armor, armament, ammunition and related facilities	205,765	191,921			397,686
(e) Service-wide facilities and depot supply system	2,365,187	1,113,189	275,725		3,754,101
(f) Medical	316,478	126,951	144,969		588,398
(g) Service-wide administration	175,251	91,663	95,961		362,875
(h) Service-wide finance	33,189	20,835	11,249		70,273
(i) Recruiting and general service-wide training	128,089	64,168	241,100		433,337

Department of Defense—New obligational authority by cost category, fiscal year 1952—Continued

[Thousands of dollars]

Cost category	Army	Navy	Air Force	OSD	Total
III. Major procurement and production costs.....	9,480,983	7,629,156	12,633,242	-----	29,743,381
(a) Aircraft.....	36,223	3,475,910	10,952,620	-----	14,464,753
(b) Ships and harbor craft.....	110,582	1,786,087	47,926	-----	1,944,595
(c) Combat vehicles and artillery.....	4,456,800	423,625	-----	-----	4,880,425
(d) Weapons.....	21,794	414,681	-----	-----	436,475
(e) Ammunition and guided missiles.....	1,349,413	638,222	731,770	-----	2,719,405
(f) Electronics and communications.....	782,914	570,357	387,369	-----	1,740,640
(g) Vehicles (noncombat).....	1,312,909	130,624	375,260	-----	1,818,793
(h) Special training equipment.....	48,728	47,744	93,085	-----	189,557
(i) Railroad, construction and materials handling equipment.....	261,620	141,906	45,212	-----	448,738
Expediting production.....	1,100,000	-----	-----	-----	1,100,000
IV. Acquisition and construction of real property.....	-----	-----	-----	-----	4,500,000
V. Civilian components.....	361,036	239,267	122,448	-----	713,751
VI. Research and development.....	382,032	519,600	481,000	90,000	1,472,632
(a) Direct costs.....	365,000	425,000	425,000	90,000	1,305,000
(b) Indirect costs.....	17,032	94,600	56,000	-----	167,632
VII. Industrial mobilization.....	75,083	59,092	9,380	-----	143,555
VIII. Establishment-wide activities.....	767,739	71,622	43,037	379,800	1,262,198
(a) Retired pay.....	-----	-----	-----	360,000	360,000
(b) Office of the Secretary of Defense.....	-----	-----	-----	14,800	14,800
(c) Interservice and Department wide projects.....	206,938	71,622	43,037	5,000	326,597
Prisoners of war.....	28,110	-----	-----	-----	28,110
Civilian aid in Korea.....	50,000	-----	-----	-----	50,000
Wool reserve.....	181,785	-----	-----	-----	181,785
Duck and webbing pool.....	300,906	-----	-----	-----	300,906
Contingencies.....	-----	-----	-----	75,000	75,000
Total.....	20,750,482	15,071,444	19,784,000	544,800	60,650,726

NOTE.—Departmental totals will not add to grand total because \$4.5 billion proposed legislation for military public works is not distributed.

This table does not include about \$1,500,000,000 for the liquidation of prior obligations, and for certain special accounts which are appropriated for automatically.

From the table you will see that, roughly speaking, major procurement and production calls for 49 percent of the total; operation and maintenance calls for about 20 percent; military personnel for about 17 percent; acquisition and construction of real property for about 8 percent; research and development for about 3 percent; establishment wide activities for about 2 percent; and civilian components, industrial mobilization and contingencies for about 1 percent.

Further details as to the three armed services in this connection are reserved for others or for discussion under the 5-minute rule.

THE BASIS

The hearings indicate that the basis for the program recommended is four-fold: First, to assure full support for our active forces; second, to secure critical items for expanding forces at an early date; third, to bring into being production facilities beyond our present needs but available and vital in the event of the necessity of full mobilization; and, fourth, to provide public works, to be later considered, essential to operational needs.

ADEQUACY

The program before us is, of course, not sufficient for full mobilization. It is regarded as sufficient for security in the event of trouble pending all-out mobilization. It is the maximum program recommended at this time by any civilian or military official primarily responsible for national defense.

You will find statements by almost every one of those officials in the hearings to this effect.

We are told, however, that there is to be further analysis and decision within the next few months.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman from Massachusetts care to yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I desired to ask the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] another question, but he did not yield for that purpose. Here is the question: Having in mind the testimony of General Vandenberg, which appears at pages 18 and 19 of part 4; and having in mind what the gentleman from Texas said about the money that will be spent, actually spent, I wish to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts this question: Assuming that a peace treaty is reached in Korea, or a cease-fire agreement, or whatever you want to call it, and that during the next 5 to 7 months no other real activities break out, will the various administrators of the military program continue spending the money from two and one-half to four billion dollars per month volume and thus take the chance of having obsolete equipment on their hands instead of repeating the very thing which General Vandenberg testified they did following World War II?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. If I understand the gentleman's question I will answer it in this way: I think that the program before us for actual consideration today is based not on Korea but on the over-all picture.

It is based on the necessity of recapturing some of the material power which we have lost during the last 5 years, since 1945 when we were probably the greatest military power in the world's history, when we were supposed to have on hand some \$19,000,000,000 worth of weapons and equipment, including tens

of thousands of fighting planes. I think this program is an attempt to recapture part of that military power, and to offset the action of the President, who on two occasions impounded over \$700,000,000, made available by the Congress for an expanded Air Force.

As far as Korea is concerned it will be necessary to request additional funds for activity there after July 1, 1951.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas, my fellow member on the subcommittee.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I think the answer to the gentleman's question is, "Yes," the spending will continue for the reason that while there has not been much said about it, and I will stress it later in my remarks, these funds do not provide merely for the Army in being of three and a half million in the Army, Navy and Air Force, but it also contemplates the building up of mobilization reserves, which means there will be money spent, there will be tanks built, there will be trucks built, there will be planes built, there will be many, many items purchased which will, of course, in some cases stand on vacant lots to deteriorate, but that is the price we must pay in this preparedness program.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I agree with what both gentlemen have said. I am also practical enough to know that the average military administrator will not depend more upon what is now coming off the production line for the long pull, I say he will not depend more upon that for the long pull than he will depend upon the equipment in the blueprint stage, because the best way on earth to get licked in any kind of a fight is to have obsolete equipment. What I fear about the whole thing is that the military administrators will fear obsolescence

more than they will fear other things and will wake up without equipment, as General Vandenberg testified they laid down on the job after we had forced money on them. Read the testimony of General Vandenberg. A military man is just as human as anybody else. He want the most up-to-date equipment.

We better keep our minds on this question of obsolescence. Take the testimony of the boys coming back from Korea right now with respect to your most up-to-date American planes versus the Russian planes. The boys say the most terrible thing we face is the fact that the Russians are right up to us. Suppose you had obsolete equipment, where would you be in Korea or anywhere else? I can understand that you have to have a skeleton, but you have \$30,000,000,000 in here for equipment, you have \$12,000,000,000 for the maintenance of that equipment, two different things entirely. I am not talking about not spending any of the \$30,000,000,000, I am talking about, will you spend \$29,000,000,000 or \$27,000,000,000 or only \$15,000,000,000? That is the question I raise.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I think the point the gentleman raises is important and I think the fact that all through this program it is contemplated that we shall construct what may be called excess capacity in productive facilities which will not be used now but which will be available for use if and when the need arises. Has an important bearing.

Mr. CRAWFORD. We can use that and we will have to use that type of equipment in the peacetime era if we maintain full employment in this country. I am not afraid of the productive facilities. They do not become obsolete. It is your keen up-to-date precision fighting equipment that becomes obsolete. Just as soon as the other fellow beats us to a better gun, that is how quick it becomes obsolete.

SMALL BUSINESS AND GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to speak at too great length, but in view of the enormous procurement that is called for here amounting to practically half of the total recommended, I want to include a word in behalf of small business.

Congress has emphasized again and again its intent that small business should obtain a fair share of Government procurement. It is specifically emphasized in this bill in section 619.

That intent is not being complied with by the armed services in my part of the world at least. For example, great concentrations of military shoe contracts have been placed with the large shoe manufacturers of the country, although the small concerns in this area have been surveyed and approved as defense facilities, although they won most of the Army and Navy "E" awards during World War II, and although shoes orders are needed in the worst way to prevent the lay-off of a great number of skilled workers and thereby the elimination of defense facilities.

The procurement program policy referred to by the head of the Munitions Board in the course of these hearings is

apparently just not being applied by the armed services in this field at any rate.

The Congress, in my opinion, should see to it that fair treatment for small business generally, is made a reality and not a theory.

COMMITTEE CUTS

Now, the committee, as you have noted, has effected cuts ostensibly to the extent of \$1,542,608,500. If you take \$60,000,000,000 as the over-all base, that cut represents just about a 2½-percent reduction.

A large part of this cut however is really merely deferment.

Take the \$500,000,000 cut in the Air Force, and the \$278,000,000 cut in Army Ordnance. Those two items alone account for 50 percent of the over-all cut, and they are pure and simple deferments. They are technically reductions, because the authority to incur the necessary obligations will not be required in fiscal 1952, but they are not reductions in the long run.

If you eliminate them, the remaining items of reduction amount to about 1¼ percent on the basis of a \$60,000,000,000 total.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, the cuts in this bill have been very moderate ones. I am confident that they will not hurt national defense in any sense of the word.

I think we could have gone further, but no one on the committee wants to sponsor cuts unless he is convinced that they will not have harmful effects upon national defense, and I have indicated earlier in my remarks the difficulties we have had in obtaining essential information.

I am sure we could have gone further if we had not been subjected to these handicaps.

I am sure we could have gone very much further if we had had a full-time staff of experts responsible solely to your committee and to the Congress, with authority to go into the departments, working 12 months a year, such as I have already advocated.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. Does this \$56,062,000,000 include all the expenditures? I understood the gentleman to say it does not include current expenditures for Korea; is that correct? There will have to be additional appropriations for that purpose.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. There is nothing in this bill for the financing of the war in Korea after June 30 last, so that there will have to be a further request for whatever may be required.

Mr. BENDER. Today's headline says, "Three hundred and seventy million dollars arms for China urged on Hill." That is not included in this bill, is it? That is \$307,000,000 for Chiang Kai-shek's forces.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. No; it is not included.

Mr. BENDER. How much more does the gentleman estimate will be required in addition to the \$56,062,000,000? Has the gentleman any idea as to how many

special bills there are and how much more money is requested or will be requested? Does the gentleman have any estimates?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Well, there is \$4,500,000,000 pending for public works. Then if Korea should go on for another year, nobody apparently knows exactly what the cost will be, but I have seen estimates of between seven and eight billion dollars. Then there is something like \$161,000,000 for the partial pay-as-you-go program in Japan. Then there is an \$8,500,000,000 request pending for foreign aid which is to be considered in the very near future. Then there is the possibility of further requests in the autumn, particularly with respect to the Air Corps at the end of the so-called period of decision.

Mr. BENDER. Will the gentleman tell us whether or not the subcommittee took into consideration what the Committee on Ways and Means provided by way of a tax bill, and what revenues will be raised? Also, how will the appropriations contained in this bill and those estimated as coming later, as outlined by the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, compare with the money we anticipate raising as the result of this tax bill?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I do not know that I have the time to go into that in detail. In a general way, however, I understand that the over-all expenditure contemplated by the President's budget amounts to some \$71,600,000,000, and the over-all estimated revenue amounts to about \$55,000,000,000, leaving an estimated deficit of about \$16,000,000,000. The request before the House is part of that expenditure.

Mr. BENDER. So if any of these extras come along, it will create an additional deficit unless you raise new taxes?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. It would increase the deficit only to the extent that the extras were not included in the President's budget.

Mr. BENDER. Does this \$56,000,000,000 recommendation come to the floor of the House with the unanimous recommendation of the subcommittee?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. In the main the \$56,000,000,000 recommendation is the unanimous recommendation of the committee under existing conditions. I think there might be some amendments here or there that the minority might feel free to support, but, in the main, I think the report is a unanimous report.

Mr. BENDER. The gentleman does not feel there is any relief from these expenditures unless we change administrations next year?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I will say to the gentleman from Ohio that I am sure that would be very helpful.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. I think the committee has done an excellent piece of work. What I should like to know is this: At any time in the consideration of this bill did the gentleman's committee ever raise the question as to how long this Nation can stand that kind of drain, or any other nation on the face of the earth?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I think it was in the minds of the committee continually. I do not think the military witnesses before the committee, however, were probably the best qualified witnesses on this question.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. I should like to recall the fact that Mr. Charles E. Wilson, Director of Defense Mobilization, appeared before the committee and his testimony is included in volume 1. As the gentleman from Massachusetts has said, this question was in the background of our thinking at all times. If the members of the committee had their way, speaking from an idealistic view, we would go far beyond this bill in our preparedness effort. In other words, if it is possible we want far more defense than this money will buy.

Mr. DONDERO. The reason I asked that question is that Russia more than 20 years ago said she would force the United States to spend herself into destruction. I am just wondering whether or not we are on that road.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. We are certainly between the two horns of a dilemma, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If the gentleman will yield for one observation, go back to what General Eisenhower repeatedly said to us over here in the auditorium, where he kept emphasizing that if this job is done it must be done within solvency. You either stay within solvency or you fail. That goes for every Member of this House. You cannot duck that issue.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The gentleman, of course, is absolutely correct.

Mr. DONDERO. That means just one thing: If economic collapse is to be the portion of the American people, then we lose our form of government and the Republic of the United States will vanish from the face of the earth.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is right.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. May I bring these remarks to a close, Mr. Chairman, by referring to three or four fields in which I think thorough investigation and research should be conducted with a view to further and substantial savings in the future.

CIVILIAN PERSONNEL

The matter of civilian personnel has been referred to.

The figures in this connection have been extremely difficult to obtain. We have had several different sets of figures. There is one table which was furnished for the record from which the conclusion can be drawn that there are three different over-all totals in respect to civilian personnel for one of the armed services.

Based on tables inserted in the RECORD at my request, however, the best conclusion I can come to is that the over-all picture presented by the three services is a picture calling for one civilian employee for every two and six-tenths persons in uniform.

That ratio is just about twice as high as it was during World War II. It is very much higher than in other military

organizations, information in respect to which was furnished off the record. One military organization was reported having a ratio as low as 1 civilian to every 14 military personnel.

The request submitted to your committee was for an increase in civilian personnel from 1,240,000 to 1,506,000 or an increase of 266,399; 117,654 for the Army, 80,745 for the Navy, and 68,000 for the Air Force.

You can find the details with respect to the services at page 101 of part 2 of the hearings, at page 248 of part 3 of the hearings, and at page 46 of part 4 of the hearings.

I call your attention to the high ratio of civilian to military personnel in all three services, to the very large number of civilians engaged in publicity work in the Army, and to the high ratio of workers engaged in personnel work in all three services.

I may mention, in this connection, Mr. Chairman, that an inquiry which I made a couple of years ago from leading business organizations such as railways, steel companies, manufacturing and business machine establishments, showed that these concerns had a ratio of personnel workers to over-all forces of from 1 to 200 to from 1 to 3,500.

The requested increase came on top of an enormous hiring of civilian personnel for many months.

You will recall that Senator BYRD pointed out in May of this year that ever since March 1950 the armed services had been hiring civilian personnel at the rate of about one employee for every minute during the entire period. The rate in March was 1,600 a day, the rate in June was 1,400 a day.

Everybody seems to recognize the situation.

Assistant Secretary Rosenberg appeared before the committee and said:

We are going to scrutinize every request for every job to see that it is necessary before the request is granted.

Secretary of the Navy Kimball in a reply to a statement on my part that civilian personnel in all three services had seemed to me for years to be extremely high, said:

I agree with you, sir. I have been critical of this for over 2 years. I have been fussing about it all the time.

The committee has reduced the request for an increase by 52,105 man-years. In so doing, however, it has approved an increase of 214,066 man-years, giving the services a total of about 1,452,232 as compared to 3,500,000 for military personnel.

I doubt very much if we have even scratched the surface in this respect.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The gentleman mentioned Mrs. Rosenberg's appearance before the committee.

Within the last week or so I saw a statement from Mrs. Rosenberg that she had ordered a cut of 5 percent in the civilian personnel of the armed services department. I do not understand why she has ordered a cut of 5 percent on one side and then you are giving an

additional amount of employees on the other side. Can you give us some explanation of that?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I know she has been taking steps with a view to trying to meet the situation. I have not seen the statement you refer to.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. This is a specific step. Here is what this letter said: That she was ordering a cut of 5 percent and putting the present personnel as the ceiling above which they would not go. If that is the case, why provide for extra employees in this bill?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I see the chairman of the subcommittee standing. Perhaps he can contribute something by way of explanation.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. MAHON. Of course, Mrs. Rosenberg was before the subcommittee. She frankly admitted that we did not have a good manpower-management program in operation in the Defense Department. We agreed with her. She told of plans to improve the situation. Her testimony was interesting as the hearings will reveal. We did what we could to encourage her and others who appeared, to place in operation a good manpower-utilization program. She presented to the committee, or rather to me as the subcommittee chairman, some time ago a statement with respect to the 5-percent reduction which she was making in the military and civilian personnel in departmental activities in the Washington area. It was not necessarily a reduction throughout the services. In other words, the efforts of the committee, we hope, are getting some results. This is one indication that the determination of Congress to get better utilization of military and civilian personnel is bearing fruit.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SCRIVNER. For the benefit of the gentlemen who have raised some question about civilian personnel in the military, if you are an optimist you may take a little more optimism into your soul by reading Mrs. Rosenberg's own statement at page 177, part I, of the hearings, down near the bottom of the page, where she said:

I would say that when it came to doing utilization work I have done more than probably anyone in this country today, both in utilization of civilian plants and of Government facilities.

Now, when we have an admitted expert like that as the right-hand adviser of the Secretary of Defense, you are entitled to look forward during the coming months to not merely a 5-percent reduction in employees around the Pentagon Building, but we might look to as much as 15- or possibly 20-percent reduction. If that comes to pass, she will have proved her worth.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I just want to comment that in the first place I am

not an optimist, so I do not look upon that situation very hopefully.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I did not say the gentleman was. I did not say I was. I merely said if a person were an optimist.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. In the second place, I still cannot understand why, if the forces of civilian personnel are being reduced, the committee is authorizing an increase. It just does not add up, to me.

Mr. SCRIVNER. This statement which Mrs. Rosenberg made about the 5-percent decrease apparently came after her appearance before our committee, although she did tell us there would be a reduction.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. That would seem to be all the more reason why you ought to cut out the increase in personnel.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Of course, that letter was not a part of the testimony before us, but she did tell us she would reduce enough to man a couple of battle-ships and two divisions of the Army. Of course, I wondered when she said it how she was going to do it. We are still hopeful that the result will be obtained.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. I might say that the committee took a practical view of the matter and sought to help by eliminating funds for 75,000 of the people that the Department had planned to put on.

EXPEDITING CONSTRUCTION

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, there are one or two other fields that should be carefully investigated with a view to future savings. There is, for example, the field of expediting construction.

Information received from the Office of Defense Mobilization some time ago indicated that the Defense Department at that time was engaged in a program of facilities expansion amounting to about \$5,900,000,000, then undergoing revision. There is a large item for that here in this bill, \$1,100,000,000 for the Army alone.

The information also indicated that among other financing by the Government to expedite construction, were loan guaranties under section 301 of the Defense Production Act, \$301,000,000; direct loans under section 302 of that act, and by the RFC, \$116,800,000; and certificates of necessity for tax amortization to the tune of \$3,300,000,000, or 69 percent of the value of facilities appraised at \$4,700,000,000.

I wish I felt satisfied that this entire picture is being properly coordinated.

The dangers of abuse and possible effects on the national economy are all too apparent.

ACQUISITION AND CONSTRUCTION OF REAL PROPERTY

Acquisition and construction of real property, Mr. Chairman, is another field calling for the closest scrutiny. The pending request for \$4,500,000,000 in this connection will be considered shortly.

The committee is advised that a so-called citizens' committee appointed by

the Air Force to aid in effecting economies in respect to its program calling for about 300 projects at an over-all cost of some \$5,500,000,000, was able to suggest practical means of effecting savings amounting to perhaps \$1,000,000,000.

I think the other branches of the service might perhaps profit by this experience.

PURCHASING POLICIES

Purchasing by the Quartermaster and other departments is another field that requires close scrutiny.

Enormous purchases of various commodities in short periods of time raise inevitably the questions whether or not the amounts purchased were necessary; and, if necessary, whether purchases over a longer period of time would not have resulted in better prices with less bad effects upon the markets for the commodities purchased.

These are but examples, Mr. Chairman. There are many fields where investigation should be helpful not only to the Congress but to the armed services themselves.

General-purpose trucks, for instance, seem to the layman to be exceedingly high in number. I think the average is one general-purpose truck for every 50 men in the entire United States Army today. Overtime computation would seem to be unrealistic in certain instances. Travel items would seem to be very high.

A way must be found, Mr. Chairman, in the interest of all concerned to assure better control over the enormous expenditures in this all-important field.

Mr. Chairman, in the main I am going along with this bill. I am going along with it not because I do not think that further cuts would be possible if the information were available. I am going along with it because I do not want to sponsor or support cuts unless I am sure that they will not be harmful. I am going along with it because I am confident that the cuts that have been made will not be damaging in any way. I am going along with it because I believe that speed is absolutely vital in what may be termed a belated effort to rebuild our essential military power.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts has consumed 57 minutes.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself one-half minute.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman who has just addressed the Committee, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH], and the gentleman who is about to address the Committee, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES], were selected as representatives of the subcommittee to go to Europe during the progress of the hearings to look into the situation there and to confer with General Eisenhower.

The Subcommittee on Military Appropriations was also requested to send a representative to the atomic-bomb test in the Pacific during the spring of this year, but the committee hearings were such that it was not possible to send anyone from the committee to that test in the Pacific.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present. This is a bill involving a very large sum of money, and I think the membership should know something about it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Sixty Members are present, not a quorum.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 148]

Abernethy	Garmatz	Poulson
Allen, Ill.	Gathings	Powell
Allen, La.	Gordon	Prouty
Bakewell	Gore	Quinn
Borden	Grant	Rabaut
Baring	Gwinn	Radwan
Barrett	Hébert	Ramsay
Bates, Ky.	Herlong	Rankin
Beall	Hess	Reed, Ill.
Betts	Hillings	Rees, Kans.
Bishop	Hinshaw	Regan
Boggs, La.	Hope	Sabath
Bosone	Johnson	Sadlak
Bow	Kearney	St. George
Breen	Kee	Saylor
Brehm	Kennedy	Scott,
Busbey	Kilburn	Hugh D., Jr.
Case	Klein	Scudder
Celler	Kluczynski	Shelley
Chatham	Lesinski	Short
Chelf	Lucas	Smith, Kans.
Colmer	McDonough	Spence
Dague	McGrath	Stanley
Davis, Ga.	McGregor	Stockman
Davis, Tenn.	McKinnon	Taber
Dawson	McMillan	Taylor
Delaney	Machrowicz	Thomas
Dingell	Mack, Ill.	Welch
Dollinger	Miller, Calif.	Werdel
Donohue	Mitchell	Wheeler
Durham	Morgan	Whitaker
Eaton	Morris	Whitten
Eberharter	Morrison	Wickersham
Ellsworth	Moulder	Willis
Elston	Murray, Tenn.	Winstead
Engle	Murray, Wis.	Wolcott
Fallon	Norrell	Wood, Ga.
Fellows	O'Hara	Wood, Idaho
Fine	O'Toole	Woodruff
Frazier	Passman	Yorty

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. KEOGH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 5054, the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1952, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 312 Members responded to their names, a quorum; and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] is recognized for 25 minutes.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, this bill, unprecedented in many respects, and the report which accompanies it—very probably the most complete and voluminous report which has accompanied any appropriations bill—come to the floor because of the splendid leadership on the part of one of the ablest subcommittee chairmen of this or any other Congress, because of the complete cooperation and devotion to the job by the members of the committee itself, plus the loyal and helpful, constant and painstaking support on the part of the staff members.

I single out for an especial pat on the back, Bob Lambert, who for many years has done an extraordinarily good job for this committee; Larry Miller, who does the patient, the tedious, the little, never-ending jobs that someone has to do to help the rest of us get on with the work; and the investigating staff who contributed singularly to the work of the committee.

Mr. Chairman, this is the Nation's biggest appropriation bill except in time of full-scale war.

Mr. Chairman, there is not much difference between that stage and this except in the fuller realization of national danger which would accompany total war. By any standards of comparison we have known the casualties are little, if any, less in this limited war and the cost is no less. Mind you, I speak of standards of comparison we have known in the past. They would be tame in the light of the requirements of total war now.

One of the questions which is foremost in the minds of the people is, What are we getting for our defense dollar? Every day people ask each of us what kind of defense do we actually have.

Before attempting to answer that, let us appraise realistically our status. We do not make wars; we build defenses against them; we cannot know positively whether the threat of further limited war or of total war is imminent. Therefore, we cannot know whether our defense budget is adequate. We do know that we cannot afford the cost of full mobilization for an indefinite period. If Russia intends to try to win the world for communism by the use of recurring threats and by tension alone, she will want to cause us to spend more than we can afford. Yet there is now the possibility of war at any time. We all recognize that fact. Russia may be waiting only in an effort to perfect her jet fighter planes and her guided missiles to the point that she can better ward off atomic-bomb attacks on her cities and industries. We should know by this time that communism under the sponsorship of the Kremlin is a kind of creeping paralysis which can be checked, but only by vigorous methods. It was checked at Berlin, in Greece, and in Korea. It can be checked at any time we come positively to grips with it. That means more than a strong military defense. It means that the people must be aroused to the necessity for continuing a vigorous action.

Now, back to the question of military strength, we on the committee have given many months of very close study to our military organization. I can tell you emphatically that we do not have a shoestring force or a weak force. We were caught with our pants down in Korea for a number of reasons which no longer exist. Our troop training was less realistic; we had much less equipment and our forces then in being were spread thin over the world. We already had pulled out of Korea. The picture is very different now. I do not say we are ready for world war and I do not know of any time when this Nation will ever be ready for full-scale war at an instant's

notice. Only the dictators are able to sustain full mobilization in peacetime. But I can tell you this: If we are jumped again anywhere in the world, the nation that does it is going to get hurt badly and within a very short time. We are stronger now than we have ever been at a time we were not engaged in a full-scale war.

That strength is reflected both in men and material. We are closing the gap on Communist strength. Industrial production is now coming up more rapidly than manpower figures, but there is an appreciable build-up in both, and if plans now approved are carried through to completion by our allies the manpower gap also will soon close rapidly.

This bill carries a lot of money. No committee likes to recommend an expenditure of this magnitude. But we know what happened in Korea and we know what can happen again. In all sincerity, we do not believe there is any alternative but a stronger defense than we have had in the past. If there is not going to be a second chance in the future, if it is now or never for the survival of this country, there is no reason to apologize for the size of this budget.

On the bill we have made reductions of 3 percent. That is not very much. I would like to see greater savings made if it could be done without injuring the defense build-up. We probed the budget very carefully, searching out soft spots where additional savings might be justified. The committee has agreed that this is the best estimate that we could present to the floor. If anyone can show me where additional savings can be made, I will join and I think the committee will join in making them. I am confident we will welcome any realistic and sincere suggestions. There is no room for waste and it should not be tolerated. I point out again that we have made a careful and thorough study—12 weeks of hearings, hundreds of witnesses, additional weeks for preparation of the bill and of the report. I think the committee has done about as good a job as the cost problems, the necessity for a continuing build-up of defenses, and the lack of a full-time investigating staff will permit.

The chairman has given a breakdown of costs: Twenty billions for the Army; fifteen billions for the Navy; and twenty billions for the Air Force; plus a billion for the Secretary of Defense and related costs. Additional costs must necessarily follow in later bills. This, too, has been explained. This will permit strength figures of one and one-half millions for the Army; 1,000,000 for the Navy; and 1,000,000 for the Air Force. We will have a total of 3,500,000 men in uniform; one and one-half million civilian personnel and an additional 5,000,000 persons will be employed in war plants.

The greater part of this money is not for men in uniform but for equipment. Procurement, including new weapons of war, mostly heavy equipment, will soak up 65 percent, or thirty-seven and one-half billions. Much of this huge amount is for weapons that were not in existence at the close of World War II, but

which are now required to insure a modern military defense. Of these great costs one billion out of five is chargeable to inflation since the start of the Korean War, inflation that was avoidable and unnecessary.

It may be of interest to note that of the money in this bill, eight billions is for pay and allowances. Ours are far and above the highest and best-paid Armed Forces in the world and it also may be interesting to note that four billions of the eight are for pay increases authorized by Congress since 1939.

One great difficulty lies in the greater costs of the weapons we buy. Not only are they technically more involved but they require additional differences in costs to us because the Communist nations take advantage of slave labor, rigid controls, and diversions of a greater percentage of available materials to war industries. That is why a fighter plane in the United States costs \$300,000, or four times what it costs in a Communist country; why a bomber costs \$2,000,000, or eight times as much; why a tank costs \$250,000, or twice as much. It costs \$2,800 an hour to fire a howitzer barrage. In other words there is a lot more to it than 7 men manning a gun. During such a barrage 500 pounds of TNT, 2,600 pounds of steel, 600 pounds of brass, 300 pounds of smokeless powder, and 1,400 civilian man-hours are used up.

Nor do we have a monopoly on better weapons. Our tank and antitank weapons ran into serious trouble at the outset of the Korean War. We lost men, equipment, and territory before that condition could be corrected. The Red jets appear to be as good as anything we have now in use. The jump in progress by Russian aviation from World War II to date is as great as any industrial achievement recorded in history. Its significance is too important to be discounted. The success of American jets against MIG's in Korea, due to better training and shooting, does not disprove these estimates of Russian planes.

It is a mistake to think of the Russians as dependent on secrets stolen from the west or on copying western models. Both in jets and tanks they have produced models superior to anything they might have copied from us.

The weapons are disturbing enough. But the fact that a despotic idea-smothering system should excel a democratic idea-fostering western technology in even these two fields for a limited time is shocking. Congress might well probe into this problem. There are indications that come to us now and then that the armed services are slow to accept or develop new ideas if they come from outside. Does rigid insistence on specifications at times overlook the chance of getting something much better? Does the convenience of dealing with large industrial units leave too little room for small-scale resourcefulness and a variety of practical experimentation?

Freedom is the great key to American success. American enterprise is again turning out wonders—particularly in the mass-production field. But is freedom getting enough free play? Or are the bureaucratic machines of the armed

services and giant industry squeezing out ingenuity and initiative? With all the advantages western democracy possesses totalitarian technology should not be playing in the same league.

Now back to the military organizations. I find today a much more realistic acceptance by the military of the true facts of our defense situation and of the necessity for continuing practical alertness. The soft, garrison duty, occupation-type forces which were frequently encountered in the early post-war years have disappeared. In the epic of Korea—and the valor of the American fighting men has never been shown to greater advantage than in Korea—and despite the early reverses and casualties, it has not been futile—in the epic of Korea, we have learned again that no one super-force can suffice for our defense and that push-button tactics will not yet win a war. All the services are needed and the foot soldier, the man on the ground, remains indispensable. Despite undisputed control of the air and sea, we would not be in Korea today but for the heroism and the sheer never-say-die spirit of the American infantryman. We would have been thrown out long ago.

American troop morale is, in my opinion, at a fine pitch. Our troops are taking a realistic view of their position. They know that if Russia were to strike at this time our people would be outnumbered, in places terribly outnumbered. They are, however, well-trained seasoned, tough troops with good commanders. I have not encountered any traces of defeatism among them. They say, "If the Russians hit us, we will give them a devil of a fight. We are not going to be pushed out of Western Europe or anywhere else."

As an indication of a more practical attitude by the military, there is the removal of supply points from the areas adjacent to the Russian zone. At one time our supplies were concentrated at points along the natural invasion route which the Russians almost certainly would follow in case of an attack. Gasoline, troops, and food were stored in tremendous quantities at these points. It constituted an open invitation to invasion with free and needed supplies to help its program. These supplies are being pulled out rapidly and reassembled in much safer areas. The most valuable supplies were removed first. Six months' supplies for our forces were at one time concentrated in the foreign areas. Within a reasonably short time this situation will be completely cleared up.

Our committee has accepted the responsibility for close and critical examination of the operations and customs of the services. We believe that added economies and efficiencies will result. If you have not done so, I urge that each of you study our report where the results of these studies are discussed in detail. Yet final responsibilities for efficiencies and economies must be within the services. We here have neither the background nor the authority to follow through to the last detail.

There are other points which disturb some of us and I want to treat with two or three of them now. I fear that

the services, particularly the Army and Air Force, are becoming "rank happy" as in World War II. Now please bear in mind that a second lieutenant, just starting out in life, fresh from college, with no costs for establishing his business or profession, gets counting flight pay, quarters and subsistence, \$5,200 per year. Under present regulations he can within a few years become a colonel at \$12,000 a year. It takes time to learn the duties and responsibilities that go with higher rank, yet I fear that the military is going back into the situation that existed in World War II when a man could go in as a second lieutenant, keep his nose clean, and in 3 or 4 years turn up as a full colonel. While the individual enjoyed the process, it was a policy that no other nation has had. It is unrealistic. In my opinion it does not permit a man to develop the capability or assume the responsibility for high rank. This was not universal, for some officers got few or no promotions. Further, it certainly became a most one-sided thing when you consider that the enlisted man with a few exceptions stayed an enlisted man throughout the war. If we are getting into that again we are going to have a costly, unnecessary amount of rank on our hands.

Unfortunately the promotions have been one-sided. In general it appears that Regulars are now serving one to two ranks, by temporary appointment, above their permanent rank, whereas the Reserves and National Guard officers in some cases are serving even below the Reserve rank they obtained upon or after separation from the service. It is known that reserves and National Guard officers far outnumber Regular officers on active duty. Yet in the higher ranks nearly all the promotions are given to Regulars. The number of general officers, almost all of them from the ranks of the Regulars, is approaching ridiculous proportions. The services are the sole judges of these matters and apparently there is no check on them from administration levels.

On a par, is the policy of the award of medals; the practice of giving them almost by the dozen to general officers makes the whole thing appear silly. If a general makes a flight in a liaison plane and if someone takes a pot shot at it from the ground, he gets a medal. If his men lose a battle, he gets a medal; if they win one, he also gets a medal. He cannot lose on medals. I object only to the fact that the GI Joe's who know the meaning of danger, who get shot at day after day, and who slog through the mud and filth of Korea, with all the hardships known to man, very seldom get medals and when they do they are almost as frequently dead as alive. The higher awards are generally made posthumously.

A complaint among company grade officers is excess paper work, excess P. I. and E., excess recreation and entertainment activities. When I showed surprise at the latter complaint, men in the field said these people are so numerous they get in each other's way. Company grade officers say they have to give too much time to paper work and records to maintain needed contact with the troops.

They feel that American troops owe much of their effectiveness to the fact that company grade officers spend much of their time with their men. They provide leadership in battle by contrast to the European practice of using noncoms for battle leadership. By spending so much time on records keeping, the company grade officers do not establish the close personal leadership they desire with their men. They state the morale of the troops is highest when in the field at hard training. They feel that in the main we still are under training rather than over training. They further feel that all personnel should have some combat field training. Apparently, it is now the practice to exempt certain service troops even in divisions from field combat training. The Germans say we are far overstaffed. We can take a lesson from the effectiveness of the German military organization. Their troops did not lead an easy life, but they were well taken care of. No one questions the fact that they were good fighters.

There are many similar points but most serious, I think, is the fact that we always seem to have to get kicked around a bit to realize the necessity for change in warfare. For instance, we have finally settled down to serious work in guided missiles. The day of the airplane as a weapon of war may be passing. Let us face the facts. If a \$10,000 guided missile can, in a few years, make it unsafe or impractical for a \$2,000,000 plane to fly, I do not want us to be the last to learn it.

If radiological warfare or germ warfare or gas warfare can render helpless our defenses and our harbors and our cities, but without destroying them so that a foe can make them valueless to us but subsequently usable to him, we cannot take a chance on being able to defeat such weapons with the conventional weapons and tactics of the last war.

In other words, we have to stay abreast of the times at all times. I fear that we will never again have time to adopt the other fellow's weapons to our own use, produce them and then beat him with them after war starts. We may in fact be fighting the last war right now. We have no choice or intention but to win it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] has expired.

Mr. MAHON. I yield the gentleman five additional minutes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I take this opportunity to commend my colleague for the splendid and able address he has made. I would like to propound this question to the gentleman, who has studied the situation: Does he not believe that unless this Congress passes this legislation, the national interest, security, and the safety of this Nation will be impaired and jeopardized?

Mr. SIKES. After many months of very careful study, I am fully in accord with the gentleman's statement about the necessity for the passage of this measure.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I just want to commend the chairman of the committee [Mr. MAHON]. I think he made a splendid address this morning, and it shows that this committee has gone into detail, and is bringing back to this House legislation that is in the national interest.

Mr. SIKES. I concur warmly with the gentleman.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARVEY. I want to congratulate the gentleman from Florida upon his very able presentation. I note that he said in the course of his discussion that this is the largest peacetime military budget the Congress has ever been called upon to approve. I am fully aware of the implications of the expenditure upon our national economy. I know the gentleman from Florida has given a great amount of study to the manner in which we could get the most for our dollar, from our military. I had the privilege of serving, during the Eightieth Congress, on a committee which investigated the disposition of war surplus. It came to our attention during the study of that committee, that a great deal of the loss that was incurred in the disposition of war surplus actually was caused through an inefficient procurement system. Largely out of that came the project by the War Munitions Board known as the uniform cataloging system for all branches of the service. Can the gentleman from Florida tell me something about the progress of this joint project within the various components of the Defense Establishment?

Mr. SIKES. I shall be glad to and at the same time I want to commend my friend from Indiana for the interest he has always shown in economy in government and in being a good citizen and a good Congressman.

Let me say that the work of cataloging is now approaching completion. We hope that it will be completed in the main by the end of the fiscal year, although, we obviously always will require certain revisions from year to year. It represents a tremendous job of simplification. Actually the catalog of service items when completed will contain about 2,200,000 items.

When the program started, the number of stock numbers was astronomical because different manufacturers used different numbers for the same item. In ship's parts alone there were 50,000,000 different stock numbers.

Sears, Roebuck catalog contains approximately 100,000 items. The Defense catalog will contain more than 2,000,000—20 times larger. Altogether, it will represent a considerable saving and added efficiency in operation.

Mr. HARVEY. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield.

Mr. JONAS. I want to say to the distinguished gentleman that if I had any doubt about whether I should vote for this bill the doubts have been dissipated after I heard his splendid dissertation

and his factual outline of this very important question that is before us. But I have this in mind: this appropriation involves \$56,000,000,000, which is about 18½ times as much as it cost to operate the Government of the United States in 1914. What I am curious about is how are we to raise this sum of money? Is it to be paid out of current income that the Government realizes in the next 2 years? Or is it to be out of a bond issue? I get these inquiries from my constituents. Just how are we going to raise this gigantic sum we are pledged to expend to inaugurate a program? What is the answer?

Mr. SIKES. I share my friend's apprehension about our ability to continue to meet this tremendous cost. It is hoped, of course, that the tax returns during the current fiscal year will be sufficiently high to meet the greater part of the cost but some of it undoubtedly will have to be charged back to the national debt. While we are spending money at an almost unprecedented rate we also are taking in money at an enormous rate. So we hope that at the end of the year the difference between expenditures and income will not be too great. I share the gentleman's apprehension, however, and I do not know how long it can continue without higher taxes or much more rigid economies.

Mr. JONAS. I thank the gentleman for his explanation.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 hour.

(Mr. SCRIVNER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, \$56,000,000,000 is a lot of dough; that is fifty-six thousand million dollars. That is \$400 for every man, woman, and child in the United States, and already every one of us from the very moment of the birth of an infant today is carrying a burden of \$1,700 mortgage against him as his share of our Federal debt. All of those things we had in our minds as we sat for these long hours and days and weeks in the hearings upon this bill. If my memory serves me correctly, some years ago we were told that if we entered the United Nations we would not need again to require such huge military spending. But after all these years there is no United Nations military force which was supposed to have stopped all wars and all aggression.

Oh, I know that in Korea there is what has been called a United Nations army. But if that is any example of what we are to expect in future years, the United States better find a better plan. There have only been 14 of the 55 United Nations members that have contributed to that force in Korea and most of those contributions have been pathetically and ridiculously small. Yet all of them have a voice in the major decisions that we have to make. Maybe that is the reason we are having some of the troubles we have encountered there.

In that Korean War—and it is a war, make no mistake about that—it is finally admitted to be that by the heads of our Military Establishment—the

United States has furnished most of the men, practically all of the money, and has incurred by far the greater number of casualties. To continue to so dissipate our resources, our finances, our manpower, can only have one result, and that is the ruination of this great Nation. The end is not yet in sight.

No one to date, exclusive of the casualties which are now approaching 100,000, can tell you what the Korean War has cost up to now or what it is going to cost in the future. There have been some guesses made running all the way from five billion, mentioned by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], up to as high as \$30,000,000,000. But for the sake of argument, let us say the Korean War has cost up \$10,000,000,000—ten thousand million dollars. The casualties that we have been reported to have inflicted upon the enemy are approximately 1,000,000. That is battle casualties and nonbattle casualties. It has cost Uncle Sam \$10,000 to inflict each enemy casualty. Figure for yourself where that is going to take us if we continue at that rate. Then, of course, Uncle Sam will be expected to pick up the check for the rehabilitation of Korea. How big will that be? Nobody knows. Perhaps another eight or ten billion dollars.

Yet once again, if my memory serves me, the billions we were to spend and now have spent—more to go—on the so-called Marshall plan were to bring peace to the world. We were told it would make unnecessary the building of a large armed force, we were told that we would not need to resort to selective service and we would not be called upon to spend huge sums for military might and matériel. But here you are. Here is a request, following one of almost similar size in 1950, making over \$100,000,000,000 for military might in 2 years.

I will state quite frankly I would feel much better about the entire situation if we were depending, for extrication from our difficulties, on others than those who have brought us to this tragic state.

The public is entitled to ask and to be told, How come? It is just a little more than a year ago that President Truman assured the American public that the 1951 military budget would be one and a half billion dollars less than that requested in 1950; in other words it would be down to about \$12,000,000,000. Even that was a lot of dough for a peacetime military budget.

Well, overnight somebody decided we ought to start a war over in Korea, which our military men said was the last place in the world to ever start a war. So, in 1951 we have an expenditure of almost \$60,000,000,000, five times as much as the President said it was going to be. Now come rumblings and hints and suggestions that we were undoubtedly going to be faced with requests for still greater spending in the next fiscal year; a bigger air force, a bigger navy, a bigger army, a bigger debt. Maybe this is what some times is called "porch talk," which you have probably encountered in some activities. Perhaps these ominous suggestions are those that seem to usually pre-

vail just before a military appropriations bill comes before the House and the Senate, just to keep down any possible sentiment for reductions. Well, if that is true, then, of course, this is the dark hour just before the dawn, and once the bill is passed maybe we can have a little brighter outlook. We may, perchance, even find that all of these billions of dollars will not be needed and, of course, if not needed, we expect that they will not be spent. If we are not injected into another police action, if we are not called upon to make huge increases in the size of our military forces, there is a real ray of light and hope, for in this bill, without going into the details of it, there is a very large portion for the procurement of mobilization reserves of goods and supplies and equipment that all three of the services, if mobilization is not ordered during the coming fiscal year, there can be a large decrease in the next year's budget, for this reserve will not need be duplicated in the next fiscal year. Of course, there will be, as a result of this procurement program for mobilization, a lot of things that will not be immediately needed. They will be stored out in the open, many of them, and they will depreciate. Some are bound to, but this is the only way you can have the hardware ready to go if and when it is needed, so that you will have it for the training and supplying of men in the training camps here and overseas.

Then in addition to that there is a great sum in this bill that will provide "ready to go" plants, plants that will be tooled up, set up, equipped, ready to start turning at the drop of a hat, whether it is Stalin's or anybody else's. There will be some waste there, but it seemed to us that this was a real, logical, practical program of national safety insurance. Then again, of course, these tooled-up plants will not call for repeated expenditures for that purpose. There will be some maintenance, of course.

Again, quite frankly, it is fair to assume that knowing them as we do and as we have known them in the past, all three of the armed services are asking for some things that an austere program could eliminate. I am quite sure that all of them, the Navy, the Army, the Air Force, and the Marines—I play no favorites—will procure some plush, some things they wanted for a long time but up to now could not get. But this committee is able and willing to eliminate plush wherever we can find it, even though we are handicapped.

There are only seven members on the committee, four on the Democrat side and three on the Republican side. While we have our differences of opinion, while we do not all agree on everything, when it comes to the security of the Nation, party lines are dropped. We have one executive secretary, Bob Lambert, who has done a good job all the time, mastering details, getting information, and Larry Miller, the clerk, who has to do a lot of leg work. Without them we would have to do a lot of it ourselves. That is the picture we have on our side of the table. But every time a bureau or department chief comes before us to present his little segment of this program

he has with him anywhere from 9 to 17 assistants, ranging all the way from majors up to three-star generals. That is the Army and Air Force, and there are the corresponding numbers and ranks in the Navy.

There you are, seven of us on our side of the table, with two assistants, and there they are on the other. If there ever was a subcommittee of Congress that needs a real, honest-to-goodness, competent staff of experts subject to our direction, subject to our control, this subcommittee is it. As you can understand, it makes us feel many times absolutely futile and helpless. Even though we may think there is something rotten in X installation or plant, we do not have the time to go to X installation or plant and see what is rotten. We have nobody to send. We cannot always expect the people from X to tell us exactly what the situation is. If we are to do a job, we must have a competent staff, and that without delay.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. I agree with the gentleman that our committee does not have and probably no committee in Congress has, an adequate staff. I think the gentleman and I would agree that by merely hiring people you do not get the job done. The military have tried that, as have other departments. It is not in numbers that we get the best results.

Mr. SCRIVNER. No.

Mr. MAHON. However, we have had investigators working and we have investigators now working for the committee with respect to various aspects of the military program.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Yes.

Mr. MAHON. Of course, it is not a perfect set-up.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I had not intended to mention that group of investigators at all, but not only is it not a perfect set-up, it is, to my way of thinking, completely inadequate, not only the functions that they perform but the report they made. I do not care to go into it any further at this time, but I think if we would sit down and talk it over among ourselves there will be practically unanimous agreement on that.

I am not going to point out, as others have, for it is not necessary, the number of hours and days that we put in. Saturdays and holidays were no exception. Here are the printed hearings, 3,500 pages, nearly two and one-half million words. There is a lot of information in there. Practically as much information was given to us that is not printed in those hearings as is printed. That was not primarily the program of the Armed Forces; that was the program of the committee, because we have sat here time after time and shuddered at the amount of intimate detailed information given on the floor of this House, in the other body, and in public statements. It made it awfully easy for Mr. Stalin and his stooges to get the information. He did not have to have a great staff of spies. All he had to do was have them sit up in the galleries,

and I suppose they are there today, listening to what took place on the floor of this House. Yet in a representative Republic such as ours you, as Members of this House of Representatives, as Representatives of your districts, are entitled to know just as many of the facts as it is possible to give you.

These four volumes of hearings, if you will read them, will give you a lot of these facts. The members of the committee, as they have in the past and will during the course of debate tomorrow, will gladly attempt to answer any questions you may ask on the floor, if possible; and if we deem that inadvisable for the sake of national security, we will answer you in private.

It should be recalled that this Subcommittee on Military Appropriations does not deal with policy. We deal with dollars. We do not make or form the military policy of this Nation. That is the responsibility of the President and his advisers. We do not carry out the program. We do not spend the money. That is the responsibility of the members and the heads of the three branches of our Armed Forces. But that is not to say we cannot ask a lot of questions, and do not make some savings; that we do not prod and pry, and that we do not go all the way with them. When we find a place where we think the funds requested are excessive, we cut them. If we can find waste, we try to eliminate it. I feel if we had time to go out and visit many of these installations we could probably find some soft spots, just as we did this spring when we took 5 days and visited five installations of the Army, Navy, and the Air Force. In just one we found where we could save \$27,000,000. That is a pretty good day's work for any committee.

In considering this bill, all the members of this committee, and I know I personally did, made up our minds that any doubt we might have as to the funds requested should be resolved on the side of security; and that we should have even more rather than less and more than what we might personally think was needed in some particular item or in some particular activity rather than not enough. Maybe we are too hopefully optimistic. But I feel sure that if there is no real need for some of these items requested, the money will not be spent for them. After all, national defense is pretty much like insurance. If you do not have it when the fire starts to burn your house, you cannot get it for love or money. Then it is too late. We realize that the cost of our national defense and our national security is great. But the cost and the price of defeat could be abject slavery.

Mr. Chairman, as I said a while ago, this situation in Korea is finally admitted to be a war. We have had almost 100,000 casualties on our side. It started with no notice to our military leaders. I doubt that General MacArthur had as much as 24 hours notice to put forces into Korea. They were not trained for combat. They were internal police forces. They did not have the heavy combat equipment necessary. Out of the first thousand men poured into

Korea to stop the North Korean invasion of South Korea, I doubt that there are over 125 or 150 men alive. These young Americans in Korea have done a magnificent job. As a matter of fact, some of the things that have been done during this past year prove to me that some of the statements as to the need for long pipelines and all that may be a little on the too-conservative side. Without anything over there to start with, during the first year of the Korean War, our forces moved more millions of tons of matériel and more troops than they did in the first year of World War II. It was a magnificent operation. Of course, we have had more casualties in this year in Korea than we did in the first year of World War II.

There are a lot of things that disturbed us. There are a lot of things I am unhappy about. I was disturbed during the hearings, and I still am, in spite of some of the optimistic assurances we have been given by the chairman and other Members, some of which I share, some of which I merely hold as hopes but not as realities. A lot of questions have been raised. I feel in this presentation, there is too much optimism as to the strength of the National Guard and the Organized Reserve during the next year and the coming years because the treatment afforded the members of the Reserve, both active and inactive, has been shameful and inhumane. There has been little if any regard shown to them as civilians. Of course, the men who called them into service are in the regular military service, and this is merely another incident in their military career. They do not have to reestablish their businesses. They do not have to reestablish their homes. When the thing is over these regular military men pick up and go from where they left off. But these young men in the Reserve and National Guard most of whom put in their time in World War II, are breaking up their homes a second time and losing their businesses for a second time, and yet there are uncounted millions of young Americans who have not served at all.

The breaking up of Reserve and National Guard units and using them as replacements is wrong. These men joined certain units because of their pride in that unit. They should have been sent to service in those units. It is not fair. It has not been just. They have not been treated humanely. I could tell you of thousands of instances of gross injustices that have been perpetrated upon young loyal Americans in the past 12 months.

Many other things have taken place which disturb us. The fact that so many of our high-ranking military, with long years of experience, men who are just now coming to the point where they can repay Uncle Sam in valuable service for some of the money and time that Uncle Sam has spent on them, are now retiring from the service. I do not know why. I have not had an opportunity to talk to them. I feel that the practice should be curtailed and sharply, until this emergency is over. If it is really an

emergency, then those men should be retained in the service where we can make use of their years of experience and training.

As I said a while ago, there is some "porch talk" going on. I will believe that there is a real, honest-to-goodness, grave, world-wide national emergency facing this Nation when men high in this Government will say to me quite frankly that the time has come when we can no longer compete with Russian production on a 40-hour week. Do you realize that, as things are going now, one of the reasons why the materials costs so much, for a gadget which costs a dollar to make on Friday it is a dollar and a half on Saturday, and for a gadget that costs a dollar on Friday it costs two bucks on Sunday—just twice as much. You multiply that by the thousands upon thousands of items that we are buying now, tanks, planes, guns, munitions, radar, or electronics, and it runs into a terrifically large amount.

Not only that, but we find that sometimes there is not quite as much production coming off the lines as there should be. Some people apparently fear the return of peace and peaceful days. Sometimes I am inclined to think they do, because our economy today is geared strictly to a wartime production economy. Of course, if the war plants cannot continue to go full blast many thousands will be thrown out of work, and then the specter of the depression that was feared 15 or 18 months ago will be held before us again.

Another thing that we do not like is this so-called performance budget. As a matter of fact, under a performance budget all we have been doing with some of these items is shadow boxing. Even though we will say we are making certain reductions from some of these items, it is practically a lump-sum appropriation for the three services, and they may abide by our decisions or they may not. Except for a reprimand, and a few other things we can do, there is not any legal compulsion that we can hold over them to compel them to spend the funds for the items which we set out as being what they should be spent for.

I want to call attention to the remarks of General Bradley, in which he was discussing manpower and what we face.

He said that this is a well-thought-out conservative program geared to our economy and to our needs and to our future prospects, and that the Joint Chiefs of Staff—this is page 206 of the first volume of the hearings—further recommended to the President and the Congress that about 3,500,000 men in uniform are necessary to meet the present threat as far as they can foresee. I may not be giving it the application that the gentleman who said it gave it, but you can give your own application to it, and these are the remarks found on page 202 of volume 1 of the hearings by Secretary of Defense Marshall:

I think, to repeat a little of what I have already said, the most tragic fact is that in the way of public reaction we are so easily led by the nose. I do not think we ought to admit any such docile dangerous tendency as that.

Well, that goes double; I do not think this Congress necessarily must be led by the nose by our military; we should exercise some reasonable judgment of our own. We have a dual function. We must provide for the national defense, but at the same time we are only buffer between the military demands and the taxpayer. We are the place to which they can look to see that this Nation does remain solvent. An insolvent or bankrupt America cannot be of help either here at home or any place else in the world.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I am very glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. I was very much impressed with the gentleman's statement; I subscribe to all of it. I am very much impressed with the statements I have heard from other members of the Committee here on this matter. It is a tremendous budget, a tremendous sum of money. I want to ask the gentleman if his committee has probed into every item possible that could be eliminated for the benefit of our national defense?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I could honestly answer the gentleman that we went into every conceivable angle that we possibly could in the time and with the assistance we had.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. If the gentleman will yield further—

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. What I have in mind is the cost of the maintenance of the President's yacht; is that in this bill?

Mr. SCRIVNER. The money for it, of course, is; it is included in the Navy appropriations. It is not set out exactly as such. I got a little curious about that myself.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Can the gentleman tell me how much it is?

Mr. SCRIVNER. Yes; I can tell the gentleman what it entails. It entails 8 officers and 156 enlisted men at a cost of about \$450,000 a year and about \$50,000 for maintenance and operation—that is, fuel, supplies, and repairs. Of course, at some time or other it will have to be overhauled, and that will be more. But I think you can probably conservatively say that the cost of operation of the *Williamsburg*, which is a naval vessel and one of the vessels included in the Navy's fleet, is half a million dollars a year.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Does the committee feel that that is necessary for national defense?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I do not know what the committee felt. We did not discuss it. I know what I felt. I felt and still feel that the President could very well set the example of "belt tightening" by turning the *Williamsburg* back to the Navy and let it and its crew be used again for some direct naval function.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman from Kansas, as usual, is correct when he

states the annual cost of operating the *Williamsburg* at half a million dollars. Of course, most of it, \$450,000, is for the pay of personnel.

Mr. SCRIVNER. That is right.

Mr. MAHON. We have a Navy of a certain strength. We would not send this segment of the Navy home and to that extent demobilize the Navy. So if you put the *Williamsburg* in moth balls you would still have \$450,000 for the pay of the men.

Mr. SCRIVNER. That is what I was pointing out, they would still be in the Navy but they would be performing naval functions.

Mr. MAHON. Yes. The point I am trying to make is you could not save a half million dollars by discontinuing the *Williamsburg* because you have those men in the Navy and, moreover, the men who operate the *Williamsburg* are in training and the crews are rotated. Then this practice of affording a yacht to the President has been in existence during Republican and Democratic administrations from time immemorial. Someone did tell me that Mr. Coolidge for a time abandoned the use of the yacht, but whether or not he did I do not know. This problem is not as big as it appears to be dollarwise.

Mr. SCRIVNER. There was not any contention on my part there could be any savings effected.

Mr. MAHON. I knew the gentleman had a clear grasp of the situation, but I was not sure but that his interrogator had contemplated we could save a half million dollars on this matter.

Mr. SCRIVNER. That is the reason I was making the explanation, so that the situation would be clearly understood.

Mr. MAHON. The ship would still be in commission and used in one way or another. There is a lot of the Navy, there is a lot of the Army, there is a lot of the Air Force that you do not use effectively except when war comes, and as the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER] points out, it is when the fire comes that you need your military force or your insurance policy.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Let me go one step further, since our very genial chairman spoke. As I say, we do not always agree on everything but I doubt if you can find seven men who will work harder and work together better than the seven members of this subcommittee. Since the chairman has mentioned this Air Force matter, I think if you will read the report, you will find we were a bit caustic as to some of the Air Force practices. We thought they were wasteful, and if they will heed the admonition of the chairman and other members of the committee, they can effect some very substantial dollar savings.

Mr. MAHON. May I say that I am an Air Force advocate. The committee felt—at least I know some members of the committee felt—there was too much gallivanting about over the face of the earth, speaking figuratively, by some of the Air Force flying personnel, on missions which were not strictly necessary, but not necessarily illegal, which were very costly. We have cautioned

a reduction in unnecessary flying. It costs, I believe the gentleman will recall, about \$1,000 an hour to fly a B-36 and about \$50 an hour to fly the DC-3 type plane. There are variations of cost, dependent upon the type of aircraft, of course. But when an aircraft is in the air it costs the taxpayers a lot of money and there are millions of dollars being spent in the operation of these aircraft. Nobody wants to ground the Air Force or sink the Navy, but I think it should be pointed out on the floor here, as we did in the report, that there should be better utilization of our aircraft. This idea of flying to Florida in the winter, flying to the Midwest in the fishing season, and flying north when the skiing is in progress—I am sort of exaggerating—

Mr. SCRIVNER. Not at all.

Mr. MAHON. But to accommodate one's schedule in such a way that he makes pleasure jaunts in flying aircraft, which is costly, should be abandoned. I think the Air Force, by coordination and study, will be able to maintain adequate flying and save a lot of money. Of course, there should be no curbs on essential operation or training flying.

Mr. SCRIVNER. The gentleman from Texas is correct. I think that the Members of the House would have rather enjoyed immensely once in a while if they could have been present during part of these hearings, which oftentimes was off the record, for there were many times when the gentlemen on the other side of the table were not entirely happy with what was taking place.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Is it not true that every time the *Williamsburg* goes out, a destroyer escort goes along with it?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I do not know.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. I understand that is a fact.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I do not know.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. That certainly costs time and money. I think it is a pity that the President of the United States does not set an example for the rest of the country by denying himself some of these luxuries. He is asking the people of this country to bear taxes in order to meet this tremendous defense effort which is so necessary, yet he does not set the example which we look to him to set.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Of course, that is a matter that he himself must answer to himself in his own conscience.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. In connection with the observation made by the gentleman from Kansas and the chairman on the practices of some of the air force people, what can we expect when the Commander in Chief sets the example in connection with the operation of the *Williamsburg* and this great aircraft that he uses so often, the *Independence*, and so forth?

Mr. SCRIVNER. In all fairness to the President—and I do not need to tell anybody where I stand on the President. He and I were members of the same old artillery regiment many, many years ago, and I must again tell you that he was in D battery, I was in B battery, which makes a lot of difference. I do not find any fault with the use of the *Independence* for his trips. It is an absolute essential because it is a timesaver for him just as it is a timesaver for us, and if I am correctly informed, and I believe I am, because I talked to a man about it whom I trust, when there is no immediate demand for the President to use the *Independence*, the plane, it is available to other members of the Government whose time is valuable. Of course, it costs money, but as to his use of a plane I find no fault whatsoever. It is a necessity.

Mr. BENDER. I notice here an appropriation for the United States Military Academy at West Point. Last year the appropriation was \$5,385,000, and for this year the committee reported \$6,305,000, or an increase of \$920,000. Now, with 80 or 90 or 100 boys kicked out and fewer boys to train during this next year—and I do not see how in the world they can be replaced—and with the football team practically put out of business, and with all these scouts put out of business who bludgeon us here for appointments, I do not see why we should increase that appropriation when you have a lesser personnel to work with.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Well, I will almost assure the gentleman that the amount of personnel allowed to attend West Point will be in attendance there this fall. Suppose one of your appointees was let out, that makes a vacancy that you can fill this fall, if you want to.

Mr. BENDER. You cannot fill a vacancy until the following year.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Oh, you can fill it right now. If one of your cadets goes out tomorrow you can fill it the next day.

Mr. BENDER. I am afraid the gentleman is mistaken about that.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I had not intended even to mention West Point. I think the less we say about it at the present time the better off the school and the country and the future of the Nation will be. I do not hold any brief for a lot of West Pointers, for a lot of things they do I think are absolutely inexcusable. The suggestion that it be made a postgraduate school is nothing new. I made the suggestion 3½ to 4 years ago, and I think it is a good one, because when it was established we did not have the feeder service, such as the ROTC. We have plenty of sources of supply for our military officer personnel, and 65 percent of the subjects taught in West Point are academic subjects that you can get in any standard university in the United States. The same thing is true at Annapolis. My contention has been that they should be postgraduate schools. Once these men come out of the universities of this Nation, and we have great ones, they would go in there for 1 year of purely military work, with no let-up or play. So there will be the same

amount of money for West Point as there has always been.

We did allow some additional funds for repairs and some installations that are badly needed, because some of those buildings up there are over 100 years old. The wiring is a menace not only to the buildings themselves but the entire installation.

As a result of the action of Congress, there has also been a little bit of increase in the allowances for the cadets.

Mr. BENDER. Is a celebration going on there?

Mr. SCRIVNER. There is. I think it is the one hundred fiftieth or one hundred seventy-fifth anniversary.

Mr. BENDER. They sure started off with a bang.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I know what the gentleman means. Personally, I regret this incident more than anything that has happened in recent years. It is a regrettable incident. I do not think all the fault lies entirely on the shoulders of these 90 or 100 young men.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I should like to get back to the *Independence* for a moment. Is the upkeep of the *Independence* paid for out of the President's contingent fund or is it paid for through appropriations to the Air Force?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I cannot tell the gentleman that. I would assume it would be in the same category as the *Williamsburg*, that it would be a part of the cost of operation of the Air Force.

Mr. GROSS. We just increased the President's contingent fund by \$300,000.

Mr. SCRIVNER. This committee has nothing to do with the contingent fund.

Mr. GROSS. I understand that, but does not the gentleman think the upkeep at least ought to be paid for out of the President's own funds?

Mr. SCRIVNER. No; not the *Independence*. There may have been a few trips the *Independence* has made that were not on official business, but almost without exception when I have read of the trips the President has made in the *Independence* they have been official business trips. These trips save time, money, and great inconvenience to the public.

Mr. GROSS. Some of them were over to Europe or other parts of the world to bring back some foreigners to ask us for more money.

Mr. SCRIVNER. There, again, I am not the keeper of the President's conscience. I am not the director of his activities. I am not responsible for what he does. I do not approve of a lot of the things he does, of course. Yet he is the President of the greatest Republic on the face of the earth, and there are certain attributes that go with the job, there are certain things that a person has to do in that position. Part of it is just the thing we see here once in a while when the head of some nation which we expect and hope will be a friendly nation visits this country.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, if we give them enough money.

Mr. SCRIVNER. That request, if any, comes after the visit.

Mr. GROSS. I am not opposed to the President's having an airplane, but I think that he should pay for it out of the expense funds we the Congress allotted to him. It should not be charged to the Air Force.

Mr. SCRIVNER. The President is the Commander in Chief of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force. If General Vandenberg is entitled to have a plane as Chief of Staff of the Air Force, certainly the President as Commander in Chief of all the forces is entitled to have a plane. I am not going to argue much about it. Wherever the dollars come from, they come out of the taxpayers' pockets, anyway, whether it is out of the contingent fund or out of this appropriation.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. First may I compliment the gentleman from Kansas on his splendid statement to the House this afternoon. I should like very much to identify my feelings on this subject with the feelings expressed by him.

During the course of the gentleman's remarks he mentioned the situation facing the Reserves and the National Guard units, and condemned in a sense the treatment they have been accorded by the Regular Military Establishment. In that certainly I would concur.

There is one area in there that recently came to my attention. I know the gentleman is also acquainted with it and made inquiry concerning the matter during the course of the hearings. It relates to the week end training of National Guard units and the providing of allowances for subsistence for food, during those week end training periods.

It came to my attention not long ago that in one of my communities, Manitowoc, Wis., an infantry company of the National Guard went out for week end activities, with no allowance for food. They had to go out and canvass the community for contributions to have food to feed themselves in this company while voluntarily taking their own time to train and be ready for an emergency for their country. I wonder if the gentleman can tell me if there is any provision in this bill to take care of subsistence on these week end maneuvers.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I am glad the gentleman raised that question because it did give us concern. If you will look at part 2 of the hearings relating to the Department of the Army, you will see on page 951 where that subject was discussed. I agree with the gentleman. Here a member of the National Guard is going out to do week end training, and there is no reason why he should dig into his own pocket to buy his own food. It is an order and he has to go out. It is compulsory. Why should he have to dig into his own pocket for money to buy his food sometimes costing more than his drill pay? Such situations arose all over the country. There were National Guard units in many places. Week end training is of great value. But, because of a ruling by the General Accounting Office, there was no chance

for the National Guard to use its funds for rations.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. On page 28, line 21 and 22, I notice these words, dealing with the Army and National Guard: "Subsistence for drills of 8 or more hours' duration in any one calendar day." Is that to authorize payment of subsistence?

Mr. SCRIVNER. That will authorize the use of these funds for rations on these week end drills. It is estimated that it will cost somewhere in the neighborhood of \$1,700,000 or \$1,900,000 during the course of the following year for three week end drills for each National Guard unit in the United States.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. That brings me to this question: On page 29 the amount that is appropriated is \$202,982,000.

Mr. SCRIVNER. The extra \$1,700,000—I have forgotten the exact amount—is included in the \$202,000,000.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. In other words, that is in there now?

Mr. SCRIVNER. Yes, sir.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. There are three items listed in the report under the single heading—one for the Army, one for the Air Force, and one for the Navy: Appropriation for the sale or salvage of military property. The item for the Army is budgeted at \$10,000,000. The item for the Navy, I believe, is \$4,000,000, and the item for the Air Force is budgeted at \$3,000,000. I just cannot quite understand that. It would seem to me instead of being an expense it would be an income item.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Of course, we are faced with this rather peculiar situation. That the income that each of the services received for the sale of these commodities, cut-of-date trucks, or whatever they might be, such as salvage to airplanes or salvaged parts or junk, goes into General Treasury. I cannot recall the figures shown in the hearing this year, but I have followed them in previous years, and without exception the return to the Federal Treasury has been, as I say—without exception—a greater amount than that spent for the processing or salvaging of these various materials.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. In other words, this \$16,000,000 is actually a net gain to the Government because the property might bring in \$24,000,000?

Mr. SCRIVNER. The \$16,000,000 will not be a net gain, but if the use of \$16,000,000 will make \$24,000,000 worth of salvageable material salable, and then, of course, the net gain will be \$8,000,000. But the \$24,000,000 will go into the General Treasury.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman know when the *Williamsburg* goes out on these pleasure jaunts on week-ends whether the provisions come out of the ship's stores or the Navy?

Mr. SCRIVNER. For the crew; yes.
Mr. GROSS. Well, what about those who ride on this vessel?

Mr. SCRIVNER. Undoubtedly, they come out of the White House commissary for the President and his guests.

Mr. GROSS. I understand it comes out of Navy ships stores.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I do not know, but I will make inquiry and find out.

Mr. GROSS. I would appreciate knowing.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I might even have that information for the gentleman by the time we take the bill up tomorrow under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. GROSS. I have just listened to the statement of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS], who is complaining that reservists going out to drill over the week end have no food, and have to solicit food.

Mr. SCRIVNER. That is right.

Mr. GROSS. I would like to know whether the President is being fed out of Navy ships stores and the crew of the *Williamsburg* as well.

Mr. SCRIVNER. As I say, I am not a defender of the President, but I think as far as his food and food for the guests he takes on the *Williamsburg*, whoever they may be are undoubtedly taken out of the White House fund; but I will make inquiry and find out for the gentleman.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that perhaps some of the most secret policy meetings, might have taken place on board the *Williamsburg*?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I do not know what takes place there, because, as I said, I have never been invited as a guest on the *Williamsburg*; so I cannot tell the gentleman. If they are the best kept secrets, I doubt that the gentleman from New Jersey knows what took place.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. I only put two and two together. And I find that before General Marshall's visit to Korea there was a high policy conference on board the *Williamsburg*. Perhaps it is the only place in the city of Washington or its environs where you can keep a secret without having a feature writer get hold of the story. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that the Inchon invasion plans were discussed over an open wire from New York to Washington before the invasion occurred?

Mr. SCRIVNER. Well, if in the bosom of the White House and the President's executive office he cannot have a secret meeting, I think there is something wrong some place, and there ought to be some changes made.

Mr. GROSS. Is it a matter of record that the *Williamsburg* was taken over to Potsdam and Yalta? It seems to me some of the best kept secrets were arrived at there.

Mr. SCRIVNER. No. I am quite sure it did not go over there, because those who operate it are not too happy with its operation.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. I do not believe the gentleman completed his thoughts on the performance budget.

Mr. SCRIVNER. That is a long story. I have taken too much time already.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman is referring to the lack of a green sheet?

Mr. SCRIVNER. Not only that, but the lack of detail and the lack of congressional control over what the money is going to be spent for, because eventually you are going to come in here with about a three-page bill saying so much for Secretary of Defense, so much for the Air Force, so much for the Navy, and you are not going to know a single thing about what the elements of expenditure are.

Mr. STEFAN. So much, period.

Mr. SCRIVNER. We are hoping that will not happen.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I must yield to my chairman.

Mr. MAHON. We had quite a hearing on the performance budget—as to whether or not the Army should go into a performance budget. Members of the committee have failed to find that the performance budget would help very much. It sounds good; the Hoover Commission recommended it; we have legislated, more or less authorized it, but it tends to take power away from the Congress and give more power to the administrative branch. To some extent it is a good thing for the administrative branch, but you finally come to a one-line appropriation if you carry the idea to the ultimate. One appropriation item may be for two billion or eleven billion dollars. There is transferability within the subheads of the item, and the Congress has great difficulty in controlling the expenditure of money through the performance-budget procedure. However, I think it fair to say that the Department of Defense officials have justified their request on the basis of certain expenditures, and they have more or less adhered in the expenditure to the framework of the justification before the subcommittee. We have assurances that cooperation will be provided the committee on that point. We do have a volume made available to the committee which gives instances where there has been deviation from the precise subproject from the expenditure under the project to some other project within the appropriation, but the committee is kept advised of deviations.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, my time has expired. I sincerely trust that the Members of the House will give this bill serious consideration and all be in attendance tomorrow when it is considered under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, to the previous chairman of the subcommittee and former chairman of the Navy Subcommittee when the bill was not in one unified whole, the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD], I yield 30 minutes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, due to the lateness of the hour I am not going to take up your time unnecessarily

and, in fact, there would be no particular reason for my doing so. You have had this bill explained to you in its details by men of the nth degree of competence who have applied themselves to the evidence that was presented and gave them justification for the presentations that have been made today and incorporated in H. R. 5054; yet I feel that I would be derelict if I did not say that while this has been a long and tedious process, yet to a degree I have enjoyed it. I have enjoyed working with my colleagues, both Democrat and Republican, and I think that I can add assurance to the statement that was made by my colleague the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER] at the inception of his remarks that in the consideration of this bill politics did not play a part. It was a completely harmonious approach to the problem; and while we did have our differences of concept and of evaluation it was all accomplished in a very friendly and cooperative manner.

I specifically want to pay my compliments to Mr. Bob Lambert. He is sometimes referred to as a clerk. Personally I resent the appellation "Clerk" as a title for that man's professional occupation within the committee. I find him insofar as I am individually concerned, a statistician, an economist, a lawyer, and just about everything that covers the water front, and very good at all of them.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I shall be very happy to yield to my colleague from Kansas.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I am sure the gentleman will agree with me that on the front of the hearings Mr. Lambert is properly designated with the rank he deserves, as executive secretary to the subcommittee, and a very good one, too.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I apologize for a little difference of opinion with my colleague. "Executive secretary" is sometimes conceived by those not too familiar with the procedures of this House as somewhat of an underprivileged, underpaid, undernourished type of individual. The man we are talking about is a specialist who "covers the water front."

I am not going to refer specifically to the mathematical composition of this bill; that has been done. But there has been a series of questions asked this afternoon that to me are extremely intriguing; in other words, when you are dealing with the sum of \$56,000,000,000-plus, you are undoubtedly dealing with the astronomical magnitudes of finance. But there is always a cause and a reason for everything. Why do we find ourselves in a position today where it is necessary to appear before this House with a military bill of \$56,000,000,000? I do not claim to be omnipotent in my ability to analyze or present pictures that are more realistic than anyone else can present, but I do like to let myself mentally reminisce occasionally to find out what experiences or historical procedures of the past may have contributed to bringing about a situation which requires an expenditure of this character. As I look out over the membership that

is present on the floor of the House this afternoon, I can see many faces that I have enjoyed the privilege of serving with for 14 years in this House.

I would like to call their specific attention to the fact that during the termini of World War II, you gentlemen along with myself, and you ladies as well who were serving at that time, received bundles and sacks of mail, "bring the military personnel home now, 'yesterday,' if such were possible." So I would like to indicate a passing effect that contributes to this momentary consideration, if it be permissible to say, that if we want to be frank and analyze the cause, the great American public in its psychological phase and in its operation has been a contributing factor to what is presently before us today, at least to that degree. We should have left the Armed Forces in Europe another 18 months at the least.

We are a great Nation of people and as I know the rest of the world and have been privileged to observe their activities from time to time, I want to assure you I would not trade the company I am in and the form of government I live under for anything there is any place else on earth. I want that distinctly understood. But I still reserve the right to say to my people at home, in my congressional district and in my State, "You, Mr. and Mrs. Citizen, have your responsibility. Project your thinking in the future and draw your analytical conclusions to a degree where perhaps in 5 years hence you will not have a repetition of what you are going through today."

Another factor that was very pertinently brought out by a gentleman in the early part of the addresses here, I think the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] as I recall it, definitely the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGLESWORTH] and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER] very pointedly, is, What is the limitation and how are we going to pay the bill? Well, again, I lay no claim to being one of the outstanding economists of this country. In fact, to be brutal about it, I presume I could apply myself to the country-boy psychology of life and to the horseshoeism that you apply if you do not permit yourself to become ethereal in your concepts. Beyond that I do not think I should go.

So, to the people of my great State of California, I will address myself, because that is where the political repercussions could develop, and say to them that when the time comes, Mr. and Mrs. California, and to the other States in the Union participating equally, you, Mr. State, you, Mr. County, and you, Mr. Municipality, if you should see fit to pay your own bills and quit looking upon the Federal Government as a perpetual Christmas tree, we can balance the budget.

I think that is worthy of consideration, and if I do not do anything in the closing hours of this discussion but to leave a few scattered thoughts that might be wafted into the future, I will have contributed my little bit to the discussion.

We have talked about the military. Sometimes I am inclined to believe that we are just a little supercritical. What constitutes a military concept? We send them into our academic institutions and we train him for what purpose? To be a soldier, and that is to protect the interests of this country by offense and defense procedure. After we have processed such person or individual, we do not follow a given line of specialization, such as presently is in existence in commercial occupations, but we expect that individual when he comes out to function as a banker, an engineer, a philosopher, a public-relations operator, ship constructionist, and so forth and so forth, a rather elaborate exaggeration of the mental capacity, in my opinion. So to that degree I try to temporize my criticisms and not be too forceful about them.

I do feel, however, that there is an inherent concept within the military that could be changed; particularly does this apply within the Procurement Division in all branches, where they are floating along with the convenience of historical background and in many instances not accepting the new types in the construction category that would save money for the taxpayers.

Again, perhaps, if I were in their position, I would do the same thing on the following premise: We have, as negotiating officers for contracts, a historical background of X corporation. They have been very good operators. They have done a remarkably good job in the past. Then, along comes the top or higher echelon over you and, of course, in strict confidence, we recognize his concepts "speed" very definitely. What happens? We proceed to issue those contracts just as rapidly as we can, because we do not want criticism from the top echelon that has handed those contracts down to us, with the result that we arbitrarily reach for the man or men who has been operating as contractors, whom we know, and save the time of going through interviews with some new people with untried proposals that take up more time. What I am trying to do is to approach this problem and call your attention to what I think are some of the procedures that might be improved, if some of the gentlemen would crawl out of the horse and buggy-isms of yesterday and join up with events of today, because when you and I stop and analyze modern developments of science, we all know that electronics and various and sundry experimental devices, that not only are in the making but in effect and in operation, are in no manner in accord and consistent with that policy or particular walk or life or operation that existed 10 years ago. So, I believe it might be well if some of the gentlemen who are in procurement positions would become a little more elastic in their concepts and meet modern-day events, at least to the extent of conference time, instead of seeing how soon they could brush off the emissary that might be calling at their particular desk.

And I make that application across the board, not specifically to any one division of our Government.

Insofar as the application of the incidental expenditures that have been referred to at some length today, to wit, ships, airplanes, and so forth, by the President, of course, they are there. Anyone who knows anything about the procedure recognizes that fact. The yacht that has been referred to has been a matter of standard equipment. It is not an advent of the moment. Perhaps we put some varnish on it today, something we did not do in the past, but, at least, it is an inheritance, be it good, bad, or indifferent, and I think necessary.

Going back again, if I may, to the tax situation, I have been privileged to talk with some men who were supposed to be mentally well balanced and learned in the so-called art of application and practice of taxation. I presented this problem to each one of those gentlemen. First, Mr. X. I am very much concerned about the present tax issue as it is being presented to the people of this Nation. We obviously have to have a large military expenditure because of the international situation and its potential involvement. I think that is obvious to anyone. In fact, to be frank with you, I think it has been obvious since September 1945, because it has been self-evident over that period of time as to what has been in the making. There has only been a consistent question of how soon it would explode and then how intensively the explosion might apply to us. And, when we look at that situation, again a rather homely parallel occurs to me, just how much are you and I willing to pay as an insurance premium to have the devastation take place some place else instead of our own back yard, or within the confines of our own cities. I have no panaceas, I want that understood. I am reviewing the past, as I go along, but in this tax situation I became very seriously concerned about it, as my chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] said in the early part of his address to the House, because I felt that the cost of our procurement, as it presently prevails, for our military requirements, was out of bounds. So, instead of creating a figment of my own concept, as it were, I sent down to the Procurement Division and said, "I want the increase in cost of procurement of military requirements over such and such a period of time, and it better be good, because if you give me a bad answer and I get criticism, I am coming to your doorstep with it."

I received some very definite facts from them, and at that time it was clearly indicated that the increase in price over the period of time referred to had been between 18½ and 22½ percent, which is an alarming thing, to say the least. Mind you, that was taking place under the so-called control system that Charlie Wilson is now operating under. I say this with all respect to Mr. Wilson, but I want to call that particular definite increase to your attention.

Then later on that information was followed by a statement from Secretary of Defense Marshall, in which he made the statement that "out of every \$10,000,000,000 that we are expending for military requirements as of now we

are losing \$2,000,000,000 due to existing inflated conditions." That is a pretty terrific situation to be confronted with, because if that is true, and I am personally satisfied it is true, here we are coming along with \$56,000,000,000 plus, and if you want to multiply that upon the same percentage, there goes better than \$10,000,000,000 of the taxpayers' money right out the window.

I say to all my friends who are inquiring concerning this taxation issue, I am laying specific stress on this particular aspect of it because I think it might be worthy of thought, at least. Every time we have that \$2,000,000,000 out of \$10,000,000,000 go down the rat hole of inflation, you and I and the Committee on Ways and Means have to go out to to our taxpayers and pick them up by the nape of the neck and shake that much money out of their pockets.

What did the Committee on Ways and Means do? They passed a bill for \$7,000,000,000, and it is now over in the Senate. That is not going to take care of the inflated aspect that is going to be attached to the \$56,000,000,000 you have under consideration here.

We find that a great segment of our people are saying to us as their legislative representatives, "We don't want any more increase in taxes; we don't want any more controls." I would like to ask the American public if they have any kind of *modus operandi* whereby you can have your cake and eat it, too. I think that is a question well worth consideration.

In other words, as long as we go along with a haphazard control system in this country, you are going to have to go back to your taxpayers if you supply your military requirements. So far as I am concerned, the necessity for supplying those military requirements is so firmly implanted in my mind that I would even go to the extent of closing the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior, and so forth, if I had to, in order to have this money available for military purposes. I know that is very drastic, but that is the way I feel about it. So I think it is time that we do some real homely thinking on this matter.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. It is not exactly a question of how much insurance we are willing to buy, it is a question of how much we are able to buy. All of us would like to have a \$100,000 insurance policy, but if we cannot eat T-bone steaks, we eat hamburger.

Mr. SHEPPARD. There is nothing to stop the gentleman and me from getting away from T-bone buying and onto hamburger buying.

Mr. GROSS. Not if they keep raising them at the rate of 5 cents a pound after taking 10 cents away from the farmer.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I have some farming interests of my own, although rather remote, and I cannot find myself breaking out with tears for the benefit of the farmer at the moment. He seems to be getting along pretty well. At least as a proportionate participant I am. I will put it that way.

Let us be factual about the thing. You know and I know that the dollar is only going to buy so much. Whether it is shrinking or it is holding its own it will only buy so much. Consequently, if you have to buy this microphone and you do not need that stand, I say let us take the stand out of circulation for a while and buy the microphone. When we get done needing the microphone, then we can go back and buy the stand.

Mr. GROSS. Before we get through with the farmer, may I ask the gentleman if he knows why the OPS raised the price of pork 5 cents a pound, and whether when they raised the price of pork 5 cents a pound they likewise raised the price of the hog to the farmer \$5 a hundred?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I think I can answer that with a parallel. Perhaps that might not be a nice way to answer, but I will say—upon the same premise that they have written a regulation putting scrap yards on the Pacific coast out of business and yet the steel industry is crying for more scrap. If you can answer that one, maybe I can answer your question. That is one of the mental gymnastics that come out of big business when their executives get into governmental positions. I have a great regard for them in their place but their concepts appear limited.

In this present legislative proposal, and I say this to you with the utmost sincerity, every member of this committee has applied himself diligently for a long time. The committee has been at work on this and other bills since last December. I have great respect and a very deep regard for every member of our committee. Another thing I can say to the membership of the House is that I am very proud that in spite of the political controversies which frequently take place on both sides of the Capitol, there has never been a leak out of our subcommittee. For that I am very grateful. I think we can take our place of respect as being able to keep buttoned up when it is necessary. I have very definitely resented some of the so-called free speech that people have used in talking about our military operations. I sometimes wonder just where free speech and license come in conflict. I have great respect for the person or individual who permits himself to go through operations of this character and not let his political indigestion control his good judgment.

It has been a great pleasure to have had the opportunity to work with this committee. I sincerely hope that the durability of my constituency will permit a perpetuation of this character.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL].

(Mr. HILL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, on July 24 I made a speech in the House concerning the programs and expenditures by the Voice of America and the hiring of radio talent.

I pointed out that the International Broadcasting Division of the State De-

partment had paid the following sums to five well-known radio commentators. They were: Charles Collingwood, \$900; William Downs, \$100; Griffing Bancroft, \$50; and Eric Sevareid, \$50, all four being political commentators for the Washington bureau of the Columbia Broadcasting System; and Ben Grauer, of the National Broadcasting Co., who received \$680.

In addition, I presented Mr. Grauer's record of affiliation with Communist-front organizations, pointed to the reputation of the Columbia Broadcasting System for following the Truman administration line, remarked about the fact that the Federal Communications Commission had seen fit to approve Columbia's color-television system, and last but not least, I noted the cry that went up when some small-town Illinois editors and reporters were castigated from one end of the country to the other for receiving as little as \$8 a week from the Illinois State government.

Since the speech, I have had 2 letters severely criticizing my position and 55 praising me and congratulating me for making the speech. In addition, I have been favored by a lengthy letter from Frank Stanton, president of the Columbia Broadcasting System, and an equally lengthy letter from Ben Grauer, a telegram from Ben Grauer, a long-distance phone call from Ben Grauer which was never completed because he could not reach me, and I have been the subject of a letter to the Member from New York [Mr. ROONEY] written by Edward W. Barrett, Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs.

It seems that I have stepped on a few toes, which is exactly what I aimed to do.

Let us start with Mr. Barrett's letter, which I will not place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD inasmuch as it is already in the RECORD of July 25, page 9038.

In his letter, Mr. Barrett points to Public Law 402, setting up the propaganda program, which calls upon the Secretary of State "to utilize, to the maximum extent practicable, the services and facilities of private agencies, including existing American press, publishing, radio, motion picture, and other agencies, through contractual arrangements or otherwise."

Mr. Barrett goes on to declare that the State Department has tried to comply "with these very sensible and constructive suggestions and instructions," and he declares:

I hardly need to tell you that it is a gross injustice for anyone to imply that a distinguished American radio commentator could be swayed to change his views in any respect because he received a nominal fee of \$50 to undertake a speech broadcast for the Voice of America. On the contrary, these men deserve very sincere thanks from the Nation for doing this work at fees substantially below those they can command elsewhere.

Mr. Frank Stanton, in his letter, which I will insert at a later point in my remarks, makes the same observation and quotes the same law.

Let us analyze the position taken by Mr. Barrett and Mr. Stanton.

They regard the services performed by the five commentators as patriotic. I recall no one rushing to the defense

of the Illinois newspapermen for patriotism in Illinois.

If these five commentators are working at rates greatly below those they normally command, and if they are motivated solely out of patriotism, then why do they charge anything at all? It does not seem to strike Mr. Barrett and Mr. Stanton as peculiar that Columbia supplied four out of the five commentators. Has Columbia a corner on patriotism?

Concerning the law which is cited by Mr. Barrett and Mr. Stanton, I note that the word used is "private agencies." I think I state a fact when I state that the intent of Congress was that contractual relations be set up with established business firms engaged in the dissemination of information and entertainment, rather than such arrangements be made with a few hand-picked individuals.

Be that as it may, if Mr. Barrett wishes to insist upon his interpretation of the law, then I think we might consider this proposition. Does the payment of a total of \$1,780 to five radio commentators out of a total of \$1,471,593 spent for this service constitute, in Mr. Barrett's opinion, fulfillment of "the duty of the Secretary to utilize, to the maximum extent practicable, the services and facilities of private agencies"?

Does Mr. Barrett wish to argue that expending twelve one-hundredths of 1 percent—or to be exact, .00121—constitutes the maximum usage?

I think Mr. Barrett is impaled on his own argument. He cannot have it both ways.

As to the actions of the four commentators in the Washington bureau of the Columbia Broadcasting System, I should like to cite the rules of the Congress governing the radio correspondents' galleries, from which the gentlemen of the radio cover the proceedings of the House and Senate. These rules are signed by the Speaker of the House, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, and by the chairman of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, the Honorable CARL HAYDEN. The rules are very strict, and they are similar to those covering the Press Galleries and the periodical press galleries. It is a well-known fact that on several occasions, members have been expelled from the galleries for violating the rules.

In paragraph 1 of the rules covering the Radio Correspondents' Galleries, there appears this rule:

They—

The radio correspondents—

shall further declare that they are not employed in any legislative or executive department or independent agency of the Government.

Messrs. Collingwood, Downs, Bancroft, and Severeid are members of the Radio Correspondents' Galleries and are bound by the rules. I would like to suggest to the committee governing the Radio Correspondents' Galleries that they interpret the rule that I have cited so that in the future, the four gentlemen to whom I alluded, and other members of the Radio Correspondents' Galleries, will know what their rights are when they

are so fortunate as to have the State Department retain them on a remunerative basis.

At this point I would like to insert in the RECORD the text of Mr. Frank Stanton's letter. It is extremely lengthy, and I will not read it to the House, but it is mostly concerned with a review of how the Columbia Broadcasting System was awarded color television. Evidently Mr. Stanton is deeply upset over my assertion in my speech of July 24 that "the Columbia Broadcasting System has been well treated by the Truman administration" and that its color TV system had received the approval of the Federal Communications Commission. I see nothing in Mr. Stanton's letter that refutes my remarks, inasmuch as he does not seem to quarrel with my statement that CBS has been well treated by the Truman administration.

The next letter I wish to insert in the RECORD is from Ben Grauer, which was addressed to my colleague from New York [Mr. COUDERT] and sent to me with accompanying letter from Mr. Grauer. I will not take up the time of the House to read the entire letter, but I would like to quote two key paragraphs:

Mr. Grauer writes:

I hereby state without equivocation that I have never been a member of the Communist Party or any of its branches; I am not and never have been a Communist of a fellow traveler; I have always been opposed to communism, and my record is clear proof of that opposition. * * *

Congressman HILL linked my name with a number of organizations listed as subversive. I have never been a member of any of those organizations, nor have I attended any of their meetings, nor have I contributed money to their support, with the single exception of the Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences and Professions. Along with many Americans of unquestioned loyalty, I joined this committee in 1945. I resigned in 1947 (after it had been amalgamated into the Progressive Citizens of America) when I became doubtful as to its leadership. I confirmed my resignation by letter of January 14, 1948. This was prior to the time when it was listed as subversive by the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House.

Mr. Grauer's record was made by Mr. Grauer. I simply related it to the House. He gratuitously denies things which he has not been accused of, so far as I know. He states that he has never been a member of any of the organizations listed by me in my speech of July 24, nor has he attended any of their meetings, nor has he contributed money to their support, "with the single exception of the Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences and Professions."

The facts seem to be otherwise.

On June 1950 there was published in New York City a book, which I hold in my hand, called Red Channels. The publication of this book created a furor in the entertainment industry. It was publicized far and wide. The first edition of 17,500 copies was sold out within a few months. The book was published by Counterattack, a financially responsible organization, with offices at 55 West Forty-second Street, New York City.

I now place in the RECORD an excerpt from that book covering Mr. Grauer's

record. It appears on page 67 of publication Red Channels:

Ben Grauer, radio announcer; council member, American Federation of Radio Artists. Reported as—

Artists' Front To Win the War: Sponsor (House Un-American Activities Committee, appendix 9, p. 575).

Action Committee To Free Spain Now: Signer of statement (Daily Worker, June 17, 1946, p. 2).

Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions: Attended dinner for UN delegates, Hotel Astor, New York City, April 25, 1946. List of guests. Sponsor, Broadway for Mead and Lehman dinner, Hotel Astor, October 20, 1946 (program of dinner.) Speaker, One World or None rally (Daily Worker, May 1, 1946, p. 23). Initiating sponsor, October 1945 (the Worker, December 24, 1944, p. 14). Speaker, dinner for Jo Davidson (program, October 28, 1945). Member, executive committee, radio division (Daily Worker, May 4, 1945, p. 11). Member, board of directors (leaflet). Narrator, the Fashion in Politics, fashion show, April 25, 1947 (World-Telegram, July 7, 1947).

Progressive Citizens of America: Delegate, New York State convention, February 1, 1947 (official list). Sponsor, dinner, A Salute to Jo, Hotel Commodore, New York City, April 30, 1947 (official program).

Win the Peace Conference: Sponsor, Washington, D. C., April 5-7, 1946 (list of sponsors, March 20, 1946).

Since receiving Mr. Grauer's letter, I addressed a letter to Mr. T. C. Kirkpatrick, managing editor of Counterattack. I will now read my letter to the House:

JULY 30, 1951.

MR. THEODORE KIRKPATRICK,
Counterattack, New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. KIRKPATRICK: I wonder if you, as publisher of Red Channels, could give me the following information:

1. On page 67, you list Ben Grauer, the radio commentator, as affiliated with five Communist-front organizations. Since the publication of Red Channels on June 1950, have you received any communications, directly or indirectly, either from Mr. Grauer or others, indicating that any of the information set forth about Mr. Grauer was untrue, distorted, or not representative of the real facts?

2. Is Counterattack, the publisher of Red Channels, a financially responsible organization which would have to face in court the consequences of printing untruths, slander, or libel?

3. What has been the sale of the publication Red Channels since June 1950?

I may want to use your reply in a speech I intend to make in the House. May I have your permission to do so?

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM S. HILL,
Member of Congress.

I received the following reply from Mr. Kirkpatrick:

AUGUST 3, 1951.

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: We have your letter of July 30, in which you ask three questions regarding Red Channels, the report of Communist influence in radio and television, which was published by our organization on June 22, 1950. We shall be glad to answer your questions as follows:

1. Since the publication of Red Channels, we have received no communications directly or indirectly either from Mr. Ben Grauer or others indicating that any of the informa-

tion set out on page 67 of Red Channels pertaining to Mr. Grauer was untrue, incorrect, or not factual.

2. The corporation which published Red Channels and which has been publishing Counterattack, the weekly news letter of facts to combat communism, since May 1947, is a financially responsible organization which would have to defend in court any legal action brought as a result of printing untruths, slander, or libel.

3. Approximately 17,500 copies of Red Channels have been distributed to subscribers of Counterattack and other persons throughout the United States since it was published on June 22, 1950.

You may have our permission to use any of the above information in any manner you should desire.

Respectfully yours,

T. C. KIRKPATRICK,
Managing Editor.

I can only comment that had I been Mr. Grauer, and if the records cited by Red Channels had been published about me, I would have sued Counterattack immediately. Since I have never joined any Communist-front organizations, and the chances are I will never even accidentally do so. Mr. Grauer seems to have had several such "accidents."

Let us assume, in all charity, that Mr. Grauer is as completely innocent as he protests. I think there is a lesson in Mr. Grauer's case for every one of us, including the President of the United States.

Mr. Truman, in his recent speech in Detroit, saw fit to hold up to ridicule the good people of Wisconsin because 112 of them had declined to sign a petition that contained much of the language of the Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights. Mr. Truman decried this caution on the part of the people of Wisconsin, complaining that it showed we were losing our civil liberties because countless red-blooded Americans are determined to defend this country against communism.

I think the President of the United States would have been on sounder ground had he praised the people of Wisconsin for having learned something that Mr. Grauer's record typifies. I think the President would have come far closer to upholding his constitutional oath had he devoted his remarks to warning Americans against joining organizations, sponsoring events, and signing petitions without first examining their true character.

Finally, I wish to read to the House a column written by Jack O'Brian, the radio and television editor of the New York Journal-American, published Thursday, July 26, 1951, 2 days after I made my speech:

RADIO AND TV—REPRESENTATIVE HILL LABELS
CBS A SUPPORTER OF LEFTIST TRENDS
(By Jack O'Brian)

The Columbia Broadcasting System's preference for the left, or pink, political side of broadcasting and telecasting matters was hurled right out onto the floor of Congress yesterday when Representative WILLIAM S. HILL, of Colorado, labeled CBS a strong supporter of "socialistic tendencies."

This was not startling information to the radio and television industry generally.

CBS for years has been riddled with sinister political types, the most publicized of which it was forced to ease out in recent

months with polite announcements of "resignations" following a wave of public indignation.

The public's resentment of CBS policies and performers did not move the network or its officials to do anything on the positive side in easing out the Reds and radicals.

It was deemed wiser to let them quietly walk away as if nothing more malignant was involved than their getting other jobs.

No announcement of noble future intentions nor admission of past stupidities or worse was considered. Tell the public nothing and maybe it will keep quiet was the local CBS psychology.

But the charges of Red-tinted and socialistic leanings kept on.

At one point Victor Lasky, a notable anti-Communist newspaperman and author of the best-selling *Seeds of Treason*, the story of Alger Hiss, was encouraged to think he was to be hired by the CBS news department as a quieting influence on its hysterical "liberal" element.

When he advised us he believed he might go to work at CBS we were surprised, so much so that we made our own investigation of his status as a possible future news and policy strategist.

"He isn't even being considered," was the flat statement we got on Lasky's actual status at the time he said he'd been led to believe he was all set to help tone down CBS' portside policies.

He was given the usual run-around by officials of the CBS news room all the way up to Edward R. Murrow, who sets the political tone for William Paley, CBS board chairman, in all matters of news and editorial slanting.

For several years "CBS Views the Press" was a weekly program of criticism of conservative newspapers whose policies did not parallel the Murrow appreciation of left-wing and New Deal slanted publications.

Staff members of the late and unlamented PM, whose violently leftist attitude was admired considerably around the network and its "CBS Views the Press," found sanctuary at CBS. Many still are holed in as members of the news and publicity departments.

Ben Grauer, of NBC, who, along with the four CBS newscasters, was discovered in the pay of the State Department, has an equally notable record of pinkish sympathies.

His busy little schedule of deplorable political activities gives him three lines short of a full page in Red Channels, the now-famous report of Communist influence in radio and television.

Grauer now insists no sinister coloration should be read into the page full of affiliations in organizations labeled variously as Communist fronts or subversive by the Un-American Activities Committee.

When asked about Red Channelite Grauer's inclusion among newsmen getting side-line fees from Acheson's Red-infiltrated Department, NBC said it had been asked officially by Grauer himself—since the publication of Red Channels—to investigate his record.

"We found nothing in it to indicate he is anything but a loyal American," said NBC's spokesman.

COLUMBIA BROADCASTING
SYSTEM, INC.,
New York, N. Y., August 2, 1951.

The Honorable WILLIAM S. HILL,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: In your statement of July 24, 1951, in the House of Representatives, you referred to the employment by the International Broadcasting Division of the State Department of four news reporters and analysts employed by us, and to the approval by the Federal Communications Commission of the color-television system developed by Columbia Broadcasting System. I believe that your statement is unjust to our employees, to CBS, and to the FCC.

Public Law No. 402, enacted by the Eightieth Congress, second session, provides in part as follows:

"In carrying out the provisions of this act, it shall be the duty of the Secretary to utilize, to the maximum extent practicable, the services and facilities of private agencies, including existing American press, publishing, radio, motion picture, and other agencies, through contractual arrangements or otherwise."

Our newsmen, from time to time, are called upon to perform services for various Government agencies and departments. They have been glad to do this as patriotic citizens. I am informed that in each case the fees paid to our personnel were the standard minimum fees prescribed by the International Broadcast Division of the State Department. The fee for each such broadcast represents less than one-fifth the average amount normally paid these men for a single broadcast.

It seems to me to be highly unfair to criticize expert newsmen such as Messrs. Bancroft, Collingwood, Downs, and Severeid for performing a patriotic duty. On the contrary, I think they should be praised for performing such services on the same basis as experts in any other field would perform when called upon by their Government.

As to your remarks about color television, I think you should be acquainted with the following facts:

In 1946, the Columbia Broadcasting System petitioned the Federal Communications Commission for the adoption of commercial standards for color television. Following a hearing at which the CBS system was vigorously opposed by most of the television industry, the Commission denied the CBS petition in the spring of 1947.

Subsequently, CBS continued work in the laboratory improving its color system. In the spring of 1949, top officials of CBS were requested by ranking Members of Congress to come to Washington and discuss color television. At that meeting the CBS officials were sharply criticized for not continuing to promote color television against the industry opposition, and were strongly urged to renew their efforts to have color television standards adopted by the FCC.

Shortly thereafter, the FCC on its own motion announced that a hearing on color television would be held commencing in September 1949. During this hearing, which covered 8 months and produced almost 10,000 pages of transcript, CBS introduced voluminous data on its system and conducted a number of highly successful demonstrations, both for the Commission and for the public.

In its first report on color television, the FCC concluded that color television was a decided improvement in the art and established criteria for the acceptability of any color television system. The field sequential system developed by CBS was the only system able to meet those criteria. The other two systems which had been proposed fell so far short of meeting the criteria that the Commission was forced to reject them specifically.

Despite the recent publicity of the proponent of one of the rejected systems, the fact remains that the CBS system is still the only system capable of rendering broadcast service today in color.

I am sure you recall that the Commission's adoption of the CBS system was strongly contested in the courts and was finally upheld by the Supreme Court of the United States.

I might also add that one of the most enthusiastic advocates of this last hearing on color and one of the most enthusiastic and hard-working members of the Commission in studying the subject was a Republican, Commissioner Robert F. Jones, formerly a Member of the House from the Fourth District of Ohio.

In his separate opinion dissenting in part to the first report of the FCC on the color television issue, Commissioner Jones said, among other things:

"I certainly join in all the findings and the conclusions up to and including paragraph 143, unanimously adopted by the Commission. These findings and conclusions establish that CBS is the superior color system and the only system ready for adoption. * * *

"Had the Government thrown its weight against the public's desire to buy and play with crystal sets, against receivers with morning glory loud speakers and howling signals, on the theory that radio should not be commercialized until superheterodyne and FM were invented, the tycoons of televisions would be dwarfs today and the radio industry would be but a feeble voice in America. Today we have a color system that has long since passed the howling speaker and crystal set stage. All of the Commissioners have agreed that the field sequential system is as good as black and white was in 1941 when commercial standards were set. Every proceeding must come to an end sometime. The Commission has tested the opinions of the whole industry in the crucible of exhaustive public hearings. It has determined those positions that have been unsound, lacking in imagination, and based upon fear of competition of color with black and white television. The impurities of engineering and economic thought have been burned out by the findings and conclusions to which I adhere. The industry should examine carefully the refined ore so that it may align itself with the public interest. The Commission, on the other hand, should by final decision now cut the Gordian knot which has bound color television for 10 years."

From the foregoing, there can be no question but that the CBS system of color television was adopted solely on its merits.

In view of the fact that your original statement appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, we ask that our reply also be printed in the RECORD.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK STANTON.

NEW YORK, N. Y., July 27, 1951.

Hon. WILLIAM S. HILL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HILL: I am sending you herewith, for your information, copy of a letter I have today sent to Congressman COUDERT, of New York, in whose district I reside.

Very truly yours,

BEN GRAUER.

JULY 27, 1951.

Hon. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN COUDERT: As one of your constituents, I am writing you because of a statement recently made by Congressman HILL, of Colorado, on the floor of the House, in the course of which Congressman HILL mentioned my name and gave the impression that I was friendly to Communists and Communist-front organizations.

I hereby state without equivocation that I have never been a member of the Communist Party or any of its branches; I am not and never have been a Communist or a fellow traveler; I have always been opposed to communism, and my record is clear proof of that opposition.

As a member of the national board of the American Federation of Radio Artists, American Federation of Labor, I have signed formal non-Communist oaths. I signed them with a clear conscience and without hesitation.

II

My opposition to communism is a matter of plain record, proved by my broadcasts going back for many years and extending continuously down to the present time. This anti-Communist activity of mine currently includes recordings for Radio Free Europe, operated by the Crusade for Freedom, for which I have volunteered my services without compensation. These and many other transcripts of my broadcasts are available in my files, and I invite anyone's attention to them. I am quoting representative excerpts:

On September 16, 1946, 7:15 p. m., in a broadcast from Paris over the NBC network, I said:

"The problem of reconstruction is increased by the deep and ever-widening split between East and West. Russian tactics appal and confuse American occupation officials from the lowest level up. A high American official in Berlin told me that ruthless Russian demands and restrictions were driving him from his long-held liberal views. General Tate, deputy commander in Austria, referring to the monthly Allied Council meeting last Friday, shrugged his shoulders and said: 'No progress to report again. The Russians were immovable.'"

Again, on July 27, 1947, 9 p. m. in a broadcast over the ABC network, I said:

"Russian propagandists today tried a new technique in attacking the United States. In a literary journal they accused 'reactionary American publishers' of deliberately keeping from print certain 'anti-imperialist' writings of the late Mark Twain's works. Here in New York, Harper & Bros., publishers of Twain's works, deigned to answer the Russian charge with one word, 'Rubbish.'"

On August 3, 1947, 9 p. m., in another broadcast over the ABC network, I said:

"I lead off tonight with a startling report from Budapest which gives rise to the disturbing question, Is Russia embarking on another 5-year plan, this time for increasing her military prowess? Returning Hungarians who were prisoners in Russia tell tonight of secret war production factories beyond the Ural Mountains, and a continuation throughout the Soviet Union of such wartime measures as practice black-outs and air-raid alerts. A 5-year plan by simple arithmetic would end by 1952."

On September 7, 1947, after a trip to Japan in which I had an interview with General MacArthur, I made this broadcast over Station WEAJ, New York, 11 p. m.:

"Fortunately for the Japanese, the occupation has given them something positive to replace the vacuum left by their defeat. General MacArthur's directives have established a sense of direction toward democracy—a policy firm but understanding—and aimed eventually to put the Japanese back on their feet, free from masters either religious or military. How completely that policy will succeed would be crystal gazing for me to say after so short a visit. But as of now General MacArthur's policy has taken hold and is doing a job."

On September 28, 1948, 8 a. m., in a broadcast from Paris over the NBC network, I made this comment:

"In the Security Council a Russian veto will undoubtedly shut off any action (on the Berlin blockade), but meanwhile the world will learn just how far Russia is willing to go in her power drive for control of Germany."

I leave it to fair-minded judgment whether a man who had sympathy with communism, however slight, would have praised the policies of General MacArthur or would have broadcast comments similar to those quoted above.

III

Congressman HILL linked my name with a number of organizations listed as sub-

versive. I have never been a member of any of those organizations, nor have I attended any of their meetings, nor have I contributed money to their support, with the single exception of the Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions. Along with many Americans of unquestioned loyalty, I joined this committee in 1945. I resigned in 1947 (after it had been amalgamated into the Progressive Citizens of America) when I became doubtful as to its leadership. I confirmed my resignation by letter of January 14, 1948. This was prior to the time when it was listed as subversive by the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House.

Congressman HILL also made mention of my television coverage of United Nations debates in the summer of 1950. My reporting at that time was commended by the public press. Of particular significance is a letter to me from Ambassador Warren Austin received immediately following the telecasts, in which he commended the honest and unbiased nature of my reporting.

I am prepared to amplify the facts outlined in this letter and to submit to the scrutiny of anyone any part of my career since I commenced broadcasting 20 years ago.

I am confident that Congressman HILL did not intend to make untrue statements concerning me or to create a false impression about me. This error, damaging to me, undoubtedly occurred because he was not in possession of all the pertinent facts.

Therefore, the public interest, and considerations of fair play prompt me to request that the facts set forth in this letter be inserted in the RECORD and, if possible, be given equal congressional publicity to the statement of Congressman HILL, in order to set the record straight.

Very truly yours,

BEN GRAUER.

P. S.—I am today sending a copy of this letter to Congressman HILL for his information.

B. G.

(Mr. HILL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RILEY].

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my appreciation to the chairman, my colleagues on the committee, and the committee staff for their patience, their courtesy, and their splendid cooperation with me as the youngest member of the committee. I have never had the privilege of working with an abler or more sincere or hardworking group of men.

Mr. Chairman, we are before you today recommending that you sign the largest check for military defense ever to be issued during a time of peace. We are recommending your signature because we feel that a strong defense is the only possible way to preserve peace under present world conditions. This appropriation may fittingly be called an insurance premium. The defense which it purchases is a policy of security against international aggressors.

No matter how much we build up our defense forces; no matter how many air planes we have, how many atomic bombs, how many ships and submarines, how many tanks and rocket launchers, the history of our great country proves without question that these weapons will not be used in aggression against any other nation. In the 175 years of the

history of our country, we have never sought to conquer our neighbors; we have only sought to defend ourselves and other freedom-loving peoples against those who would destroy our freedom. History will show that even where we fought a defensive war and conquered the aggressor, we have not annexed their territories to our country, but rather we have aided the conquered countries to reestablish their own governments and helped them to regain their economies. Our reputation as a Nation of good will to others is established, our national character of dealing openly and justly with our neighbor nations has been formed. We are not ashamed of our ideals and our opportunities—what we are pleased to call the American way of life. We hide behind no iron curtain. We are glad for all the world to see the privileges enjoyed under a democratic form of government—where a man is a man in his own right, and where the majesty and sanctity of the individual is recognized and protected. We would gladly share our concept of government and our ideals of liberty and justice with all peoples everywhere, but we will never try to implant these principles in the minds of men by force. We only wish now to save these heritages for ourselves and our children, and to preserve them for the day when other nations will recognize their value, and adopt them voluntarily, and without coercion, for their own use and their own happiness. If all the countries of the world today had this policy of openly and justly dealing with the other countries of the world, and with their own citizens, there would be no need for this vast expenditure of war materials on our part, nor the building up of great military machines by other governments. We arm because we are forced to do so—not for aggression, but for protection.

We bring you for your consideration and, we hope, approval, this appropriation of \$56,062,405,890 to provide for the defense of our country. The bill could be larger if our leaders had not planned well. For instance, there is an appropriation in this bill of \$2,197,000,000 for the expansion of our industrial base to manufacture planes, tanks, ships, and other defense matériel and equipment. We think this provision is sound in that it gives us the capacity to produce, should the occasion demand vast quantities of equipment and matériel. By expanding our industrial capacity, we will not have to actually build and store away such matériel and equipment as we would if our industrial base were limited. This method saves a great deal of critical material for civilian use. In other words, the impact on our civilian economy will not be as great as it would be if we had to use a limited capacity for a large output. Further, in this machine age, war industrial output of modern and efficient matériel and equipment is one of the deciding factors in case of an all-out war. The principal factor, of course, is the ability of our Armed Forces to use this equipment and matériel, and the spirit with which they use it. Should all-out mobi-

lization come, the sooner we can put adequate weapons and equipment in the hands of trained Americans, the sooner will the emergency be over.

I wish also to call your attention to the fact that should the money recommended be appropriated, that it does not lie idle in the Treasury. The Armed Forces will provide the Treasury with the schedule of payments and deliveries, bringing these schedules up to date each month. In this way, the Treasury knows what money it will need to meet these obligations and so can make provision to have the funds on hand when the time for payment comes. Under this method, there is no such thing as having an excess of funds lying idle in the Treasury and there is no such thing as paying interest on funds which are not actually being used. At the same time, by making the actual appropriations for the needs of the Armed Forces, the taxpayers know just what the defense program is costing them.

The appropriations recommended contemplate a personnel total of 3,572,716 in the Armed Forces—1,531,200 in the Army, 805,000 in the Navy, 1,061,000 in the Air Force, and 175,516 in the Marines. In addition to these, the budget contemplates a National Guard of 320,000, Organized Reserve Corps of 205,000, senior divisions ROTC of 45,000, and basic ROTC students of 96,000.

An armed force of 3,572,000 men and women is a lot of people. This is a population approximately equal to the latest population count of the city of Chicago, our second-largest city. New York City, among our metropolitan areas, is the only city that has to care for more people than there are presently in the Armed Forces of the United States. It costs a lot of money to feed and clothe this many people. Even buying at wholesale and at manufacturers' prices, the average daily ration cost of approximately \$1.10 to \$1.30 per day for each man runs into \$1,212,721,800 for a year. Clothing for the armed services amounts to \$660,575,508 a year. Then the serviceman must be paid. This amounts to another \$8,770,251,000 a year. There is nothing abnormal about these costs. In fact, I think that the Armed Forces make quite a good showing as regards food, clothing, and pay. For instance, Chicago, which has a population of 3,606,436, just a few more than are in the services, spends for food and clothing—according to the best information I can get—around \$1,720,000,000 as against the Armed Forces \$1,212,721,800.

Airplanes, ships, tanks, equipment, weapons, ammunition, and other such items—known to the defense forces as hardware—will cost \$30,108,561,000. This equipment is the most modern so far designed by human hands. It is the result of long hours of research and development and actual field tests. We do not have the manpower that many of the nations of the world have, and so it is necessary for us to have the finest weapons and the best ammunition for our men. It is only by keeping ahead of our potential enemies in the development of usable, scientific, and technical machines and equipment that we can hope to off-

set their tremendous advantage in manpower. Just as America, by means of machine tools and man-saving equipment, is able to maintain the highest per capita production in the world, so can we, with the most modern and efficient war equipment, meet and defeat an enemy many times our numerical strength.

In addition to the major items of expenses which I have touched upon, large sums are required for maintenance and operation of our Air, Army, and Navy bases, for the transportation of our men and materials, and all the incidental expenses that go with a vast organization of this kind.

As has been stated by other members of the committee, this appropriation contains very little money for permanent construction at Air, Navy, and Army bases. The appropriation for this is to be considered later this year in a separate bill. It is estimated that this construction program will run around \$4,500,000,000. We must have longer runways for our modern jet planes, new hangars to repair and recondition these planes, additional dry docks for our ships, and storage facilities for fuel to operate planes, ships, and tanks. We must have warehouses and ammunition storage to take care of our supplies and reserve equipment; we must have additional barracks, mess halls, chapels, hospitals, and other permanent structures for our expanded defense personnel.

Nor is there anything in this appropriation to take care of the ammunition used, the wear and tear on equipment, and other costs instant to the Korean conflict. There was no way to estimate the cost of Korea when this budget was made. There was no way of knowing how long the war would last, or how much material would be used. Even now no actual estimate can be given; so, of necessity, a deficiency appropriation must be considered later in the fiscal year to take care of whatever additional expenses are incurred in Korea over and above the normal operation and proposed expansion of our Army, Navy, and Air Force.

I have heard a great deal of comment regarding civilian personnel. No doubt, the Armed Forces in all its branches can utilize this personnel better than it has, and operate without having as many on the payrolls in proportion to the work as heretofore. I am convinced that the Department of Defense and the various services, Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Corps are making an effort to better organize their administration and operations to improve this condition. However, I think there is a misconception, in some quarters at least as to what constitutes civilian personnel. I think the popular conception is that a civilian employee is a pretty girl stenographer. As a matter of fact, about 60 percent of the civilian personnel employed by the armed services are mechanics to repair ships, airplanes, trucks, and other such equipment—deep blue sky, dark green sea—safe as human hands can make; skilled workers in gun factories, arsenals, and other ordnance plants. Maintenance men on the Army,

Navy, and Air Force bases, such as electricians, carpenters, plumbers, locomotive operators, street-maintenance men, janitors, trained firemen, and ordinary laborers. Their payroll will run around \$2,675,000,000. The so-called white-collar workers consisting of secretaries, stenographers, clerks, accountants, statisticians, and other such personnel amount to only 40 percent of the civilian employees and have a payroll of around \$1,700,000,000, making a grand total in dollars in the appropriation of \$4,360,029,780 for 1,443,445 civilian employees.

I have not attempted to cover more than a few major items in my discussion of this appropriation. While there is no question that economies can be effected by more businesslike procedures, I believe that the items comparable to civilian items are procured at reasonable prices. The more expensive items are the so-called hardware items—combat equipment, specialties—where competitive purchasing and volume production are both limited. We have cut the budget request by \$1,500,000,000—some items are deferments only. We are convinced that these cuts will in no way retard the rearmament program. In fact, I feel that the appropriation is full, but if I must make an error, it will be on the side of the defense effort. I am strongly in favor of approving this appropriation as submitted.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER].

(Mr. MEADER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks of the chairman of the subcommittee the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], and also to the remarks of the gentleman Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER]. I want to commend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] for his attitude of vigilance and his criticism of some of the practices of the Defense Department.

I want to commend the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER] for his emphasis on what seems to me to be the real need in this situation, namely, that the defense appropriations subcommittee ought to have a competent and extensive staff so that it could more effectively attack this huge problem of maintaining our national defense.

I think our constituents do not understand the relative weakness of the individual Members of Congress. Our time is absorbed with congressional duties, our correspondence, our duties to our constituents, our attendance upon the floor of the House and at committee meetings. Our constituents fail to realize how little time there is for thorough and detailed study and investigation of legislative proposals by the Members of Congress themselves. We need helpers. We need fact finders, or else we will never know the full extent of the problems with which we have to deal.

There is power in facts. Unless we have the facts we cannot act wisely and exercise effectively the power and authority which the Constitution vests in us. An uninformed Congress is weak. It

is unable to do much else than to approve whatever program the executive branch presents.

I want to call a witness in support of this proposition. I call as a witness the present incumbent of the White House, President Truman. I want to quote from a statement made by him at the time he was a Senator and the chairman of the special Senate committee to investigate the national defense program.

I might say that it was my privilege, although a Republican, to serve as assistant counsel to the Truman committee.

This is what the chairman of the Truman committee said on June 29, 1943:

All the boondoggling which was done—if there was any—in connection with relief appropriations could be completely blotted out by only three examples of the way in which the Army and Navy handle appropriations which we give them without any strings attached. They know how to waste money better than any other organization I have ever had anything to do with. They do an excellent job on the waste side.

We changed the construction program from the Quartermaster Department to the Engineer Department of the Army, hoping that the engineers would use their education and their prerogatives to save the tremendous appropriations which we were making. It was the duty of the Special Committee of the Senate To Investigate the National Defense Program to look into the expenditure for camp construction at Camp Blanding, Fla. That was a tremendously wasteful project. Then we had to go to Memphis, Tenn., to look at an ordnance plant, where the waste was even greater than it was at Camp Blanding.

A week or so ago the committee held a hearing in Kansas City in connection with an ordnance plant known as the Sunflower Ordnance Plant, on which it can be conservatively stated that from \$25,000,000 to \$30,000,000 was thrown away wastefully, because the checks which the engineers are supposed to make on these expenditures are not made. The engineers claim that they are spread too thin, that there are not enough men of ability to do the job.

Tremendous sums of money are being expended in the manufacture of airplanes, guns, airplane engines, and almost everything else one can imagine. I could stand here all afternoon and give example after example showing that tremendous sums of money are simply being thrown away with a scoop shovel.

In appropriating money for unlimited expenditures, I think the Appropriations Committee of the House and the Appropriations Committee of the Senate ought to have experts in their employ, just as the Finance Committee, which levies taxes to raise the money, has experts.

I have almost become a pessimist in the job which has been given to me. It seems that when public funds are to be expended no one has any interest in what happens to them, no matter what his responsibilities may be under his oath of office. I dislike to make such a statement, but unless this body and the House of Representatives exercise their prerogatives in connection with the purse strings of the Government, much of the money appropriated will be thrown away for no good purpose whatever. It will not help the war effort. We cannot obstruct this appropriation, because we know that it will be said that we are obstructing the war effort.

About a year later on August 7, 1944, in referring to the accomplishments of the committee of which he was chair-

man, President Truman, then Senator Truman, said:

In the last war I had an opportunity to observe the waste and confusion which always exist in a period of great emergency when many important decisions must be made overnight and carried out by inexperienced staffs.

But as a soldier who had deplored the waste and confusion in the last war I believed that our preparedness program should be subjected from the very first to intelligent and honest investigation so that mistakes could be caught before the damage had been done. * * *

In my opinion, the power of investigation is one of the most important powers of the Congress. The manner in which that power is exercised will largely determine the position and prestige of the Congress in the future. An informed Congress is a wise Congress; an uninformed Congress surely will forfeit a large portion of the respect and confidence of the people.

The days when Webster, Clay, and Calhoun personally could familiarize themselves with all the major matters with respect to which they were called upon to legislate are gone forever. No Senator or Representative, no matter how able or diligent, can himself hope to master all the facts necessary to legislate wisely.

The accomplishments of the Truman Committee—and I am referring now to the other members of the committee and its staff, rather than to myself—present an example of the results than can be obtained by making a factual investigation with a good staff. Similar accomplishments can be made by other special committees, as well as the standing committees of the Congress, and I particularly urge upon the Senate that it be liberal in providing ample funds for the prosecution of proper investigations. The cost of a good investigation is negligible when compared with the results which can be obtained.

I might say that the Truman committee never had a staff of more than 15 investigators. It did a marvelous job. I think all House committees ought to have sizable staffs of competent investigators, of unquestionable loyalty to the Congress, and devoted to the effective exercise of the policy-making and appropriating powers vested in the Congress.

But if there is one committee more than any other that ought to be fortified with a strong staff of able investigators it is the subcommittee handling the bill before us today.

The Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, in an unusual sense, must accept responsibility before the Congress and before the American people for the \$56,000,000,000 this bill will take in taxes from our national income. This subcommittee's hearings which have been published comprise 3,494 printed pages. But, in addition we are told the committee received in executive session the equivalent of one-third to one-half of the testimony which is printed.

It is perfectly obvious that many of the military projects for which funds are contained in this bill cannot be presented to the entire Congress and the public for reasons of military security. The seven members of this subcommittee owe a duty to the other 428 Members of the House to forestall any attempts on the part of the military to conceal boondoggles behind the curtain of secrecy.

This responsibility cannot be discharged unless this subcommittee possesses a staff with the capacity of penetrating beneath the surface of a budget request and scrutinizing carefully the real justification for the proposed expenditure.

I wonder how many Canol projects and Inter-American Highway projects are hidden within this \$56,000,000,000 bill. The Canol project cost \$135,000,000. It did not help—it impeded—our war effort in World War II. The Inter-American Highway expenditure of \$40,000,000 had nothing to do with defense except that someone had a fuzzy notion that it would create good will and continental solidarity. It likewise was a drain on materials, manpower, and critically short transportation—when the universal cry was “Too little and too late.”

The seven men on this subcommittee shoulder a terrific burden. In effect, they assure the 428 other Members of the House and the 150,000,000 American people that they have examined the \$56,000,000,000 of proposed expenditures and that they are justified as a necessary drain on the American economy.

Earlier this afternoon in a colloquy with the chairman of this subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] it developed that the subcommittee had a dozen investigators working for a period of a couple of months. In my opinion this investigative force is wholly inadequate. I believe the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] has conceded that the committee ought to have a stronger staff. Certainly, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER] argued in forceful fashion that more investigators were needed.

I believe I express no more than the general consensus of the feelings of my colleagues when I say I am confident that there is a great deal of water in this bill that the fifty-six billion could be squeezed down several billion, and that our defense would not be impaired, but improved, by an insistence that these public funds be used economically and efficiently. Certainly the observations of President Truman, made when he was a Senator, which I have quoted would support this view. Likewise the remarks of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] would support this view.

We need fact-finding investigators to squeeze the water out of these appropriations. I predict that for every dollar we spend intelligently on investigators we will save at least \$10 in weeding out extravagance and waste.

The fact that our committees are not better staffed must be laid squarely on the doorstep of the majority leadership of this House. If we act weakly and blindly they are at fault, because they have failed to fortify the committee with the means of acting with full knowledge of the facts.

The committee and the House are dealing with this huge and difficult task without adequate tools. Seven men, almost with their bare hands, are standing up to a huge organization with thousands of officials, both civilian and military, devoting their full time to the presentation of self-serving statements and doc-

uments, and inundating the committee with a plethora of testimony and charts and statistics which the committee is unable to digest, to say nothing of challenging. Under these circumstances, the Congress is at the mercy of the Executive, particularly on such a vital activity as national defense in a time of crisis.

What if they had asked for eighty billion instead of fifty-six billion? Would the committee have been able to challenge and resist the request?

What the Congress needs, more than anything else, is an instrument to help it discharge effectively its constitutional responsibilities in our modern complex society. It needs fact-finding investigators. When Congress masters the facts it will have power. Until then it will be weak, unable to cope with the trend away from democracy and toward bureaucracy.

I fear that now that the House is approaching the end of its appropriation measures, the feeling of inadequacy and lack of information we all have experienced during their consideration will subside. I fear that we will relax and wait until next year's appropriation bills come before us, when we again will realize our helplessness in coping effectively with these enormous budget requests.

The appropriating power we have on paper we cannot wield in reality for lack of the knowledge we could have obtained through investigation.

The time to start building this fact-finding instrument is now. The duty to start building competent committee staffs rests squarely on the majority leadership of the House. I call on all Americans who love democracy to insist that the leadership do its duty.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SIEMINSKI].

(Mr. SIEMINSKI asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California for this brief time, and wish to take it to say just a few words. I am not a military expert. I am on the Appropriations Committee. I feel I have a message born of my brief Korean experience. If you take it in the spirit in which it is given, I am sure it will help.

I am not here to talk about the laxity that existed when our new bazookas got to Pusan, and our troops waited 2 weeks for a training team to arrive from the States to instruct in their use, despite the fact that a man who helped write the manual on the bazooka stayed at general headquarters in Tokyo, and could have formed a coaching team overnight; nor am I here to relate the fact that when we needed tank commanders in Korea, two crackjack tank commanders stayed in general headquarters in Tokyo and were not sent into combat in Korea when their need was desperate. I do not appear as an expert. We know war is waste. Yet when we face a mission of waste, we have to be economical. I am not here to point out that right now there are thousands of tires today on heavy vehicles in our depots, weather-cracked and useless. If we moth-

balled these tires, as we did our fleet at the end of World War II, there would not be that tire waste today. Nor do I point out that our cost to overseas-pack a tank is over \$200 when it could be reduced to less than \$50 if the latest industrial technique were used. I am sure we are going to take care of those things.

I rose for one reason, to commend the military on its recent appointment of my commander in Korea, Lt. Gen. Edward Almond to be Commandant of the War College. He did the pick-and-shovel work on the Inchon invasion. It was he who got us out of Hungnam in fine order. It was Almond's X Corps that cracked the Communist spring offensive. If ever a man was worthy of being appointed as Commandant of the War College, it is General Almond, and I should like to commend the Military Establishment for its selection.

When General Almond assumes his duties this fall I am sure that the Military Establishment will take a brace combatwise as well as maintenancewise. I am sure that he will advise that rotation be applied at all times—combat, field service, occupation, a triple approach that will make the uniform stand for what it was really designed to do, to make a man ready to fight and not to go into occupational moth balls or to become a stateside strategist. If the spirit of General Almond's leadership, as reflected by the fine fighting qualities of his men in Korea, can permeate the Military Establishment, I am positive it will help keep our maintenance cost low and our combat spirit and performance high.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER].

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, at this time we are considering one of the most vital measures of interest to every one of our citizens. During the debate on this military appropriation bill, we are dealing first-hand with our national security.

Recently the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments filed House Report No. 658 on Federal supply management dealing with military and related activities. I would like to draw attention to this report because of its timely quality.

An expenditures subcommittee of which I have the honor to be chairman, visited a number of eastern seaboard military installations. After appropriate study, inquiry, and questioning the subcommittee developed that the Munitions Board should be strengthened; that the authority of the Secretary of Defense to eliminate duplication and supply activities, should be more vigilantly exercised; that Congress might well devote itself to clarification of the National Security Act of 1947, as amended. An area where there exists a need for improvement is in the programing of military procurement. A real balanced program of schedules of purchase based on advance planning and prior determination of requirements could realize both efficiency and economy for the National Defense. In the course of our field studies we were able also to note the role of the General Services Administration. This agency, created under the Federal Property and

Administrative Services Act of 1949, is furnishing only a minimum of common supply items such as pencils, typewriter ribbons, carbon paper, and so forth, to the military services. General Services Administration, in the committee view, should issue mandatory regulations for the procurement and distribution of these common military administrative items. A point which interested the committee very much was the plan presently under way by which the Air Force could possibly create an additional supply system. This departure from the existing supply support which the Air Force is receiving from the Department of the Army would result in duplication of facilities and staff, placing a needless burden on the budget of the United States.

One single element which the membership touched on in all phases of this report is the benefits which can flow from cross-servicing within and among the military departments. Until such time as we are operating under an integrated supply system it stands to reason that an excess of material by one military department should be available to that of another. This should not be predicated upon an emergency basis alone. Isolated instances of cross-servicing were brought to the attention of the committee clothed in the aura of unusual accomplishment; indeed, these and more instances should have been carried out as routine.

The remainder of this House report deals with the utilization of Government property and touches on phases of cataloging, standards and specifications, as well as personnel overstaffing; supply discipline, training, and conservation were also matters of concern to the committee. The membership lamented the noticeable lack of high calibered, broadly trained personnel in the field of supply management in the armed services. Existing training programs, with the exception of the Navy Supply Corps, have not developed the appropriate enthusiasm and response in civilian and military personnel. Modern techniques and procedures have not applied with enough energy, nor with the proper system of selection, training of personnel, and over-all management program.

Membership of this House will, of course, ask what are the areas where possible appropriation cuts can be made? I should like to remind them that a cut represents a judgment as to the direction and scope of the program; implies also the acceptance of certain principles, such as cross-servicing, common servicing, increased use of single service assignments; and, most important of all, greater centralization in the distribution phase of supply management field. For example, we must, if we are interested in small business, frown on expansion of commercial-type activities by the armed services. It will probably come as a surprise to many Members to realize the far-flung extent of just one of these activities in coffee making. This activity must have a very direct impact on the civilian economy, ties down personnel, and be based on a cost structure which reflects but a few of the

factors of cost facing civilian commercial coffee enterprises.

Oh, they will tell you that they justify coffee-making on a cost basis, but their cost standards are not of fair comparison.

In this brief period I have sought to point out a few of the matters considered by the Committee on Expenditures in this report. I commend this study on supply management to each Member of this House. It should be stressed that this is an interim report, but there should be added to that that it is a unanimous report. We are considering many important military expenditures during this session. We have a period of indefinite mobilization with us. Our industrial capacity is working at top speed to assure our national security. Military contracts are being let at the rate of one billion a week. A reading of this report will, I believe, lead each Member to the conclusion that well-planned management-supply policies can produce "a more effective fighting force, achieve a higher degree of efficiency, and better unify our strength for resisting aggression." Our report sounds a warning note:

Our resources are not unlimited. We must make maximum use of every military item so that our fighting forces can be made the strongest possible and that our industrial economy will not be needlessly drained.

I have today listened to the debate on this bill. I commend the committee on the effort and work I know they must have done. The committee I have mentioned, in going into the field, did not hold chamber proceedings to the extent we did. This committee divided itself and hoofed it through the warehouses and depots and over the various Army establishments we visited.

I am certain, and I say this with all due respect to the magnificent men in our armed services from the top to the bottom, that they are simply not qualified as managers for the vast business that is under their jurisdiction. They need the aid of people who are trained in business management. One has only to go through these establishments and see the things I pointed out to bring it home closer. It is with no feeling of disparagement that I speak of the fine men in the armed services. They are the ones on whom we depend. We depend on them for a specific purpose, to defend this Government, not to run, as it is today, one of the largest businesses in the Nation.

Mrs. HARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. I yield to the splendid gentlewoman from Indiana, who has been a very faithful and active member of the Committee on Expenditures.

Mrs. HARDEN. I wish to commend the gentleman on his splendid work as chairman of the Subcommittee on Intragovernmental Relations of the Committee on Expenditures. I congratulate him upon calling this report to the attention of the Members of the House.

Mr. BONNER. I thank the gentlewoman very much. As I have said, I think it is most timely that this should be called to the attention of the House

when we are considering such a vast appropriation.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I would like very much to take this opportunity to commend and to compliment the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER] as chairman of the House Committee on Expenditures as well as all the members of his committee for the report they have made on this particular problem of management of supply in the military branch of Government. You will recall that the Hoover Commission made a very thorough study and survey of management supply problems both in civilian activities of the Government and also through the national defense task force. The gentleman has very well followed through on some of those recommendations and has enhanced those studies through his committee. The committee has brought in a report which I hope every Member of the Congress, and every public-spirited citizen will read and ponder upon because certainly he has pinpointed what should be done to correct a rather unsatisfactory condition and to bring about great savings for the American people, as well as a greater economy and efficiency in the operation of supply management in the military branch of the Government.

Mr. BONNER. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. I yield to the gentleman who is also a very active, vigorous, and industrious worker on this committee.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I take this time to pay tribute to the very able chairman of the subcommittee that has made this report. I know the work that has gone into it and I know the sincerity with which the chairman has worked. Every view that he has expressed on the floor this afternoon meets with my full accord and approval.

Mr. BONNER. I thank the gentlemen. Of course, it was a unanimous report. The only way we will be able to bring about economy in this agency of government which today is spending about six-sevenths of our national expenditures is through management. No one would want to take a chance on voting against an appropriation for the armed services. But the place to put your finger on this situation is in legislation authorizing certain things and giving the armed services certain privileges, and directing them to do this, that, and the other thing.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. I yield.

Mr. MEADER. I would like to ask the gentleman if it is not his view that the defense business today has become big business and that businesslike methods are required if we expect to do the job properly.

Mr. BONNER. One can only imagine—one cannot realize—one can only imagine the size of this appropriation.

Of course, you know it is the largest thing in the United States today. It is the largest business in the world as far as that goes.

Mr. MEADER. Does not the gentleman agree that ordinarily the most efficient and economical method of accomplishing a particular task, is also the most likely to get results; and that this cry that "war is waste" ought to be taken with a grain of salt.

Mr. BONNER. I cannot agree that wastes should be taken with a grain of salt.

Mr. MEADER. I say the cry that "war is waste" ought to be taken with a grain of salt.

Mr. BONNER. Of course, war is waste. But war in our domestic area should not be waste. I mean the armed services at home should not contain any waste whatsoever. I can understand the waste and the loss in the field, but here at home there should be a unity in the various branches of the armed services, causing them to cooperate with each other and bring about greater efficiency. The only way to bring this home to those in authority in the armed services is for congressional committees to go out in the field and carry the message to them there because this committee has found that they do not understand the directives they get from the Pentagon. I think that was proven in our visits to the field where it was admitted.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. I yield.

Mr. MAHON. Insofar as possible I am sure the members of the appropriations subcommittee for the Department of Defense would like every Member of Congress to constitute himself a committee of one to work toward better efficiency in the Department of Defense as well as in all other fields of the Government. Members of our subcommittee are desirous of receiving from any source at any time information in regard to irregularities and suggestions as to how economy and efficiency can be promoted. In connection with our effort to get better management—and better management is the thing we need—

Mr. BONNER. Management is the thing.

Mr. MAHON. That is exactly what we are trying to do.

Mr. BONNER. Cooperation among the services and management in the services is what you need.

Mr. MAHON. We have appropriated, over a period of a decade, money, hundreds of thousands of dollars, to send the cream of the crop in the Military Establishment, officers, to Harvard and other schools of business. Many of the men in uniform are graduates of Harvard business schools and other equally reputable institutions.

Mr. BONNER. Let me interrupt you right there, please. The Army will take a man out of the field, send him to a supply school, or some other school for business, and then put him back in the artillery.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. In this better management we are seeking, are they to come from civilians or members of the Armed Forces?

Mr. BONNER. That is a difficult thing to answer. I think it will have to come from better unity in both. The over-all directive is from a man who is trained to fight. He does not pay much regard to efficiency or economy in the agency he is directing. That is with all due respect to the splendid record they have made.

I would like to make just one other statement. There has been raised the question of jurisdiction in this committee. I want it thoroughly understood that the committee which I head as chairman certainly does not desire to take jurisdiction away from any committee, or in any way encroach upon its jurisdiction.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, there are no further requests for time. The Clerk may read.

The Clerk read down to and including line 3 on page 2.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. KEOGH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5054) making appropriations for the National Security Council, the National Security Resources Board, and for military functions administered by the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken on the bill this afternoon may have the privilege of revising and extending their remarks and inserting brief extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. PRIEST asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, the Majority Leader asked me to announce, for information of the Members, that the next order of business, following the completion of the pending bill, will be the military construction bill, an authorization bill for the military construction program, from the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. Can the gentleman tell us when the vote will take place on the resolution having to do with the Oatis case?

Mr. PRIEST. May I say to the gentleman I am not in a position to make a statement on that subject at this particular time.

CORRECTION OF ROLL CALL

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, on roll call 147 I am recorded as absent. I was present and answered to my name. I ask unanimous consent that the permanent Record and Journal be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

(Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes tomorrow, following the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.)

BOND IN THE HAROLD R. CHRISTOFFEL CASE

(Mr. ZABLOCKI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the action of the Department of Justice in taking steps to revoke the bond of Harold R. Christoffel, a former Milwaukee labor leader who was convicted of perjury, because this bond was furnished by a Communist-front organization, the Civil Rights Congress.

It is indeed gratifying to note that the precedent recently established by a Federal court in New York, pertaining to revocation of bond money furnished by the Civil Rights Congress, is being followed, and that the Justice Department does not consider such bonds to be acceptable. The reasons for such attitude are self-evident: first of all, because such bond money offers very little assurance that the person in question will not try to disappear and evade justice; secondly, because, particularly in the case of Christoffel, there is no reason why this man, twice convicted by our juries, should be free today, possibly furthering Communist activities in the critical times for our national security.

It is my opinion that the revocation of bond posted by the Civil Rights Congress was called for in the case of Christoffel. He perjured himself before the House Labor Committee on March 1, 1947, when he said that he had no Communist affiliations. That was 4 years ago. Since that time, he was twice convicted for his offense in accordance with due process of law. The second conviction in this case was decided on March 14, 1950. That was over a year ago. The appeal from that decision is still to be argued some time in the future. I feel that the appeals court has been dilly-dallying with this case too long, while, in the meantime, Christoffel has been free on a bond posted by a Communist-front organization.

The wheels of justice have to move slowly at times to afford each one a fair deal. In some cases, they move too slowly. I commend the action of the Justice Department, and hope that the appeals court will act on this case soon.

under the provisions of the act of July 12, 1951 (Public Law 78), \$950,000, of which \$750,000 shall be for the establishment of a working capital fund, such fund to be used for the payment of those expenses for which employers are liable under agreements entered into pursuant to section 502 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended by the act of July 12, 1951, and such fund to be reimbursed from payments made to the United States by employers pursuant to such agreements: *Provided*, That expenditures from this appropriation shall be charged to the applicable appropriations when enacted into law.

The House joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 5054) making appropriations for the National Security Council, the National Security Resources Board, and for military functions administered by the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 5054, with Mr. KEOGH in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday the Clerk had read the first paragraph of the bill.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman from New York is ranking minority member of the subcommittee and of the whole Committee on Appropriations and he has done a workmanlike job on the pending bill. His services to the committee and the country are very great indeed.

Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that the gentleman from New York worked with the committee for weeks on this bill, and that he was not able to be present yesterday, I ask unanimous consent, if it is his pleasure, that he be permitted to proceed for an additional 5 minutes, or for any additional time he may require.

Mr. TABER. I do not believe I will need very much more. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to discuss at this time the details of this bill. There are some things that I believe should be spoken of now, however. I feel a responsibility to discuss them myself.

We have had a great deal of agitation in the past 4 or 5 years for the so-called performance budget. The Committee on Armed Services was inveigled into placing a requirement for that in the unification bill. So far as it has proceeded, and so far as our experience with it is concerned, the

performance budget idea has been used for the purpose of consolidating appropriations and covering up the activities of the armed services in such a way that it makes it almost absolutely impossible for the Committee on Appropriations to find out what the whole picture is as of today. It takes days and days, which should not be spent, and which would not be spent, if these justifications were made up properly and gave us the details which we need in order to form an intelligent judgment of what should be appropriated. I believe that our 11-week hearings could have been reduced by at least 3 weeks, if the justifications and the information which should be provided had been properly provided for us.

The full situation is such that there is only one way out of it, if we are going to continue operating that way, and that is for the Committee on Appropriations, and frankly if I have an opportunity to do so I am going to propose it another year, to break down every one of these appropriations into the different subheads under which they are operated and fix the detail of the situation in such shape that the armed services should pay some attention to the Congress and what we provide.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Is the minority adequately represented on these subcommittees and do you have an opportunity to learn what is in the bill, except what you as a Congressman individually may learn from your own inquiry?

Mr. TABER. The minority upon this committee consists of three members, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH], the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER], and myself. The majority consists of four members, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES], and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RILEY]. There has never been a time during the operation of this committee that the minority has not been given every opportunity to develop any information they could get out of the witnesses. The worst trouble with the picture has been that the witnesses that were produced did not know enough about their subject that they could make intelligent answers to the questions which were asked of them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Frankly, I am going to make this suggestion. I think in order to obtain any satisfactory supervision over the operation of the armed services establishment, the appropriations subcommittee itself should have a staff which would go into the question of what the armed services are doing with the money they are spending; and that

that operation should begin and be practically continuous all the way through. I do not think we can afford to be parsimonious about the expenditure of a small sum of money for the committee to do the job. Frankly, I think that job could be done better under the supervision of the armed services subcommittee than in any other way.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. It is not my purpose to be critical at all, but here you are with a \$56,000,000,000 appropriation. There have been many statements about waste and extravagance and unnecessary billions in there. But I do not know. What am I to do? How can I intelligently determine how I should vote?

Mr. TABER. Frankly, it is an exceedingly difficult matter for anybody, either a member of the subcommittee or not, to know exactly what should be done. The only way we can tell is by the investigation that we are able to make.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Within three or four billion would satisfy me.

Mr. TABER. Frankly, I do not think that we are able to get the quality and quantity of information with reference to this subject that would place us in the best position to pass on the validity of all the items that are contained in the bill.

Last year, when the Korean business came on all of a sudden, there was practically no scrutiny on the part of the committee. Such a thing was practically impossible. At the present time we have tried to give it as much scrutiny as was possible in the time we have had available. But the armed services did not present their budget to the Congress at all until the 1st of May. If we had had the budget for the armed services by the middle of January, as we should have, it would have been possible for us to hold hearings and be ready to report more intelligently by the middle of May. I doubt very much if, under any circumstances, we could possibly have been ready with a report that would be intelligent before the middle of May at the very earliest. Perhaps it would have been the 1st of June. But I do feel that we must take such steps in the committee by breaking down the different items and insisting upon justifications which thoroughly explain the items and on witnesses who will tell us the story. I do not want to be captious. I do not want to place undue burdens upon the services, but the very least that they can do in their presentations to the Congress is to tell what the money is wanted for and to be perfectly frank and open and aboveboard with the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. At this time I am not going any farther than I have gone. I just wanted to call attention to these facts and to the situation and to say that we are facing a very serious situation. To my mind the armed services, and every other department of the Government, must come before the Congress with an intelligent, straightforward statement, prepared to go into details as far as is necessary, to explain the reason for their requests. Unless that is done, it is absolutely impossible for the Congress intelligently to legislate and appropriate.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the matter of civilian personnel is something that gives Members very great concern. The Department of Defense had on June 30 about 1,170,000 civilians on the payroll. This includes white-collar and blue-collar workers.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. SIKES. Is it not also true that although we are authorizing the employment of additional people it does not mean that all of those people are going to be placed on the payroll overnight? This is a continuing build-up, and during that build-up the committee is going to continue to scrutinize very closely what takes place in the Pentagon and the Department of Defense generally, so that we will have a hand on the program, and we will insist very strenuously from time to time that they not employ more personnel than they actually require.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am wondering if in view of the astronomical size of this appropriation, the unprecedented size of it, the Committee on Appropriations is setting up any sort of organization to oversee in a way the expenditure of these funds.

Mr. MAHON. We are constantly, week in and week out, trying to keep in close touch with these expenditures and we have investigators at work at all times. We do have a staff, which is not at present fully adequate, but additional men are being recruited. We do need more assistance.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. On June 1, 1950, there were 317,567 white-collar clerical workers in the Army, Navy and Air Force. On July 1 last there were 494,363. I understand that figure has been increasing about a thousand a day since that time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. In the bill now before the committee, you are asking funds to support 641,765 purely white collar workers. During World War II, at the highest peak of the war in June 1945, we had one civilian employee to 15 uniformed men. If the full number of white collar workers is allowed as requested in this bill you will have 1 to every 5.2 uniformed men.

My question is, How can we justify appropriating billions of dollars for so many civilian employees that you are asking for in this bill when we know that at the present time there are over 18,000 civilian employees, white collar employees, working in the Pentagon alone, with very little to do in proportion to what they should do, and how can you justify piling on more civilian employees?

Mr. MAHON. Well, the gentleman heard my previous remarks that efforts are being made to reduce the civilian personnel to the very lowest minimum. I should like to say, however, that a Congressman cannot run his office, a newspaper cannot put out the paper, the Pentagon cannot handle tens of thousands of letters and communications each day, one cannot run his farm in Iowa or in Texas without people.

Mr. JENSEN. We understand all that.

Mr. MAHON. You cannot run a base without people, you cannot have airplanes and ships in operation without people, you cannot operate this big Government without a lot of people.

Mr. JENSEN. And I want to remind the gentleman that a private business cannot employ two or three times more people than they need and avoid going bankrupt. That is what we are doing in this instance.

Mr. MAHON. If the gentleman will read my remarks which will appear hereafter in the RECORD he will receive considerable information. I share his desire to effect every possible economy in manpower and money and resources.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. One thing the gentleman's committee is trying to do is to get the men in uniform off of the civilian jobs and get them where they will be in the combat line.

Mr. MAHON. We could reduce the white-collar workers by 200,000 and let the military people do much of the work which is now being done by civilians. When we get our men fully trained, and we have a proper build-up and everything is in shape, if that time happily comes 2 or 3 years from now, we can perhaps let the military personnel do a lot of work now being done by the civilians.

CIVILIAN PERSONNEL

Now, I want to take a few minutes to tell you some of the facts about civilian personnel in the Department. I am speaking about those connected with regular military functions and not those on such programs as Army civil functions and mutual defense aid for which funds are provided in other bills. I want to give you a few over-all figures as to how many people they have, how many they requested for 1952, what classes and types of personnel they are, what functions they are assigned to in broad terms, and the reductions the committee has recommended.

As has been stated, we have in the past year appropriated very large sums to increase our military forces and to provide them with the necessary ships, planes, tanks, guns, and other equipment and facilities. Larger sums are included in the pending bill. We have provided and are continuing to provide for expanding our industrial production to meet these needs. We are reactivating defense plants and installations, buying and channeling new equipment to the forces and into depots. New equipment has to be inspected. Billions of dollars worth of old equipment and installations have to be maintained and operated. Our defense program is still in the build-up stage in many respects and will be for many months to come. The military program is a tremendously large undertaking, and it requires people to do the job. In consequence, the Department has been increasing its civilian personnel for more than a year. This bill provides funds for further increases in personnel but not to the extent requested.

Everybody throughout the country, even people in Government, and certainly Members of Congress, seem to agree that there is waste and extravagance in utilization by the Government of civilian personnel. From my investigations I want to say that I certainly agree with this view. After all, 150,000,000 Americans cannot be wrong.

We cannot condone such waste and inefficiency especially at a time when we must make sure that every dollar we must spend counts. One of the best ways to cut civilian personnel is through better management by the Defense Department on the Washington level with a follow-through down to each installation and activity. The crying need is for better management from top to bottom. That we have demanded of the Department of Defense and we have received assurances of cooperation. If our request is properly heeded by the Defense Establishment, the reduction in civilian personnel will be below the reductions made in the bill by the committee. We shall hopefully await results. Better ways of devising reductions can be discovered within the Military Establishment than without.

I shall cite some over-all figures. For the fiscal year 1951, when you add in all the supplementals during the year, the Department had funds for about 1,279,000 civilian positions. They estimated

that on June 30, 1951, they would have about 1,261,000 people on board. But they did not reach that total. According to the best figures we have, their actual on-board strength last June 30 was about 1,170,000.

For fiscal year 1952 they requested about 1,494,000 positions, or 214,000 more than the 1,279,000 for 1951. They assumed that at June 30, 1952—the end of fiscal 1952—they would have on board a total of about 1,459,000 employees. That is people on board. If they were to reach that total, it would mean an increase in people during this present fiscal year of about 289,000 above the 1,170,000 they had on board last June 30. The number on the rolls is always some below the number of positions, because they cannot keep every position filled all the time.

You know, these budgets are made for personnel in terms of what they call man-years. That is the term they use, and it simply means a full 12 months' employment and pay. When you are building up your personnel throughout the year, you don't ask for money for all the people for the full year—you put in only for the part of the year you expect to have the people on the roll. I mention that because when we marked up the bill, we made our reductions in man-years. The reductions in numbers of people will run higher. So, for man-years, the 1951 total was estimated at approximately 1,013,000 and the 1952 total requested is 1,375,000, an increase of 362,000.

WHITE AND BLUE COLLARED EMPLOYEES

So that Members of the House will have a better understanding of these huge figures, I want to give you some breakdown of them. Take the 1,170,000 that were on the rolls on June 30. Of that number, 730,000 were what they refer to as blue collar workers. That is about 62 percent of the total. They are the people who work in the shipyards, the arsenals, the repair and overhaul of planes and ships, the maintenance and operation of posts, camps, stations, depots, and so on. The other 38 percent total 440,000 who are the so-called white collared workers. They likewise cover a multitude of functions and activities and are located all over the world. They include of course people here in the Pentagon and elsewhere around Washington, at command headquarters, in procurement work, at hospitals, research and development people, service-wide supply and other administrative activities, and of course most of them are located at the same places the so-called blue collar people are. Of the 289,000 more they wanted to put on during this year, 184,000 are blue collar and 105,000 are in the white collar category. Now, there is inefficient use and overstaffing in the blue collar category as well as in the white collars but I think this breakdown will give you a little better idea of the classes of civilian personnel in the military.

CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES BY MAJOR TYPES OF WORK

Let me give you a breakdown this way. I think this is a revealing breakdown of the very large number of civilian employees.

The approximately 1,500,000 civilian personnel to be in the defense establish-

ment in the current fiscal year 1952 are distributed as follows:

Type of work	Number	Percent
Directly engaged in procurement, production, maintenance, and operation of major matériel programs.....	580,000	40.0
Maintenance of equipment, reactivation of stations and operation of depot supply systems.....	542,000	35.0
Medical.....	54,918	3.7
Recruiting, training, and instruction.....	60,446	4.0
Civilian components.....	22,658	1.5
Research and development.....	77,040	5.1
Industrial mobilization.....	9,528	.6
Establishment-wide activities.....	48,836	3.2
Administration.....	78,635	5.2
Finance.....	23,613	1.6
Other.....	8,394	.6

You will note from this list that about 3 out of every 4 civilian employees of the Defense Department are directly engaged in producing, overhauling, and rehabilitating the planes, ships, and weapons of war; maintaining the stations; or in providing arms to the troops.

COMMITTEE REDUCTIONS IN CIVILIAN PERSONNEL

As I said, the total man-years estimated for 1952 is 1,375,000. I also indicated that the Department came into the fiscal year 1952 with considerably less people on board than they had expected. We have taken that fact into account in making our recommendations. Now what reductions have we made? Specifically, we have made reductions approximating 52,000 man-years and total funds of approximately \$145,000,000. That number of man-years, or full year employment, that much of a cut on a man-year basis means considerably more when it is stated in terms of actual numbers of employees. Because this budget was made on the assumption of an ascending rate of civilian personnel employment, I feel confident in estimating that the reduction of 52,000 man-years is the equivalent of roughly 75,000 to 80,000 actual employees who otherwise would go on the rolls during this fiscal year.

There are two points I want to make about these reductions in civilian personnel. First, we could make much larger cuts in civilian personnel by deciding that more of the production work in Government arsenals, shipyards, and the like was going to be contracted out to private industry and therefore let private industry do the hiring instead of the Government. This would accomplish very substantial reductions in Federal employment, but we would still have to appropriate the money to pay private industry for doing the work. Possibly much of the maintenance and repair work at posts, bases, camps, and stations could be contracted out and thus further reduce the number of employees but not necessarily the cost. I feel that private industry, big and little, should be encouraged to the maximum in the defense effort, but to close all Government shops, arsenals, shipyards, and so forth, and contract the work to private industry at this stage would mean a terrific slowdown in the defense effort and vastly greater costs to the taxpayer. Of course, we know that in some of these things it would not be

feasible to go very far in that direction because it would be foolish to let Government facilities, for example, stand idle when they were needed in the defense effort.

The other point—and the details are too complicated to discuss here—is that while I have given you over-all civilian personnel figures for 1952, not all the funds for those people are in this bill we are now considering. A good deal of the personnel are being paid from funds previously appropriated for work undertaken in such things as shipbuilding and work in various Government arsenals. It is important that that fact be kept in mind.

We have tried to apply our judgment as best we could to the requests that were before us for civilian personnel. I feel that the cuts are fully in order. In some instances they may not have been deep enough, but the committee was anxious not to injure the defense program in any way. The Department has a serious responsibility to do a better job in determining their needs for personnel, employing only what they need, and making the best use possible of those they do hire. We have got to make the most of our manpower and other resources.

PUBLIC INFORMATION ACTIVITIES

Incidentally, in connection with these reductions in civilian personnel, I want to mention that we feel—and so state in our report—that some cuts are in order against public information activities in the departments. We have inquired into that subject, and the details are in the printed hearings. We believe they have too many people assigned to that kind of work. I mention this particularly because the House on other bills has evidenced some concern about the number of people employed for information and publicity work in the various departments of the Government, and has made some reductions or placed limitations on expenditures for such purposes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, I have asked for this time, and the additional time, to speak, if I may, as one of the run-of-the-mine Members of the House who does not have the privilege of serving on either the great Committee on Appropriations or on the equally great Committee on Armed Services. I speak as one of those who is not at all certain just what this bill provides or what all of the items in it means. I believe, in speaking as I will, that I will perhaps be representing a great portion of the membership of this House, or, at least, that which they are thinking.

I question very seriously that there are many Americans who can comprehend or understand what the huge amount carried in the total appropri-

tion as provided in this bill, \$56,062,-405,890, really means. Certainly, there are few of us here who can read this bill, fully understand it, and know all, or even very much, about it. The report of the Appropriations Subcommittee was made available only a few short hours ago. I do not know, and I do not believe many Members of this Congress, including many members of the Subcommittee on Military Appropriations, for whom I have the highest regard and the highest respect, and who, I realize have worked diligently and hard and long, know whether or not the appropriation items contained in this bill are actually needed, or whether these proposed expenditures are adequately justified.

But I am convinced of one thing, and believe most of the membership of the House will agree with me, that those who represent and speak for the armed services of our country have asked for at least as much money as they expected to get, and perhaps have asked for even a great deal more than they believed the Congress would appropriate.

Let us get down to facts for a minute.

As an individual Member of this House, one who has not had the privilege of serving on either of these great committees, I do not know whether some of the items contained in this bill are necessary or unnecessary—whether the amounts requested are too large or too small.

Let us take some of the appropriation items. For instance, let us turn to page 10, if you have the bill before you. Let us take the amount provided for the pay of the Army, \$3,297,076,000. I do not believe there is anyone in the world who knows whether that last \$76,000, or that last \$297,000,000 for that matter, will be needed or not. I certainly do not. I am simply going to have to accept that item on the word of the committee, and on the word of the military officers who requested it, that it is necessary.

Let us take the travel item down lower on page 10, amounting to \$245,000,000. I do not know, and I do not believe any of you here know, whether it is necessary to spend \$245,000,000 for travel or whether the military could get by on \$145,000,000, or whether it may become necessary to spend \$300,000,000 for travel. So we are just shooting in the dark.

We can go on through this bill, item by item. How much will be needed for this activity and how much for that activity? I do not know, and I do not believe anyone else knows, including those who head our Armed Forces, how much will be necessary to provide an adequate national defense.

However, I do know one thing from my own knowledge and experience, and that is that our so-called "high brass" have been just as wrong in the past, many, many times, as any of us who are here have ever been wrong. I do not believe those in the Pentagon are either omnipotent or omniscient. I do not believe they know all and we know nothing.

I do know one other thing, too; some of the committees of this House, notably a subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services, headed, I believe, by the

gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES], have conducted studies and investigations and made reports showing all sorts of waste and extravagance can be found in our military effort.

I do know that we, as Members of Congress, as representatives of the people, have a responsibility to take every step, and to engage in every proper action to see to it the money the American people are paying in the form of taxes to support their Government, and to maintain an adequate and necessary national defense, is expended wisely and well.

I do know the average American who has never served in Congress or on a congressional committee has the idea that our military forces are wasteful in many of their expenditures and endeavors, and often demand public moneys which they do not need. I do know that some of us who made some investigations during World War II found every evidence of much waste, extravagance, and poor judgment in the spending of defense funds.

I also know there is a strong conviction within the mind of the average American citizen that there is a great waste of personnel in the Government, including the military or defense branches of the Government, and that we have civilian employees falling all over themselves in most Federal offices and military installations. I do not know what would happen if the average American citizen could visit some of our military installations and see the number of employees who are sitting around and doing little of real value or making much of a contribution to our national defense effort for the money they are being paid.

I do know that the American people would be as shocked as I have been if they could visit some of the coffee bars in the Pentagon during office hours. Seemingly about the only public officials who are staying on the job here in Washington and fighting a 7-day week war these days are the Members of Congress and their office staffs, because time after time I have had the experience that from Friday evening on, and generally from 3 or 4 o'clock Friday afternoon, I should like to say to the chairman of the subcommittee, until Monday morning, of being unable to find anybody at the Pentagon to answer a question for me. So I say to you, it is my fixed conviction—and I have been forced to come to this conclusion—that we have the responsibility to see to it that there is established or created some sort of a "watchdog committee" or organization representing all of us here in the House, because you and I as individual Members cannot do it, which will ride herd on these appropriations we are making here today which we have to accept on faith unless we can get absolute evidence they are not needed and are unnecessary. Such evidence is rather difficult to get, as I am sure the members of this subcommittee will agree. We should have this "watchdog committee" or organization made up—and this is just a suggestion—of an equal number of members from the Committee on Armed Services, from the

Committee on Appropriations, from the Committee on Expenditures, and, perhaps an equal number from the general House membership to represent all of us, to see to it that the funds appropriated by this bill are spent as we intend, and as the American people who are making the great sacrifices to furnish the money which we are appropriating, expect their money to be spent.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I think that such a "watchdog committee" should be above politics. I therefore believe it should be bipartisan. We should not have any majority or any minority on such a committee. That committee should be given a sufficient staff of experts and investigators to ferret out, if you please, any waste or extravagance in our defense effort wherever it may exist. If such a committee does nothing else in the world, it will at least be a good traffic cop. Remember when the traffic policeman, the motorcycle cop, or the highway patrolman is on duty on a main highway somehow or other the traffic begins to flow at the proper rate of speed, there is not so much cutting of corners, and not nearly so many accidents. That is exactly what we need in connection with these appropriations. So I hope we will meet our full responsibility in seeing to it there is some sort of organization such as I have suggested created to do the job which must be done because fifty-six billion-and-some-odd-million dollars we are voting here today is not chicken feed. It represents the sweat, the toil, and the sacrifices, if you please, of some 154,000,000 Americans. So let us do a complete job and follow up to see that the money we appropriate is spent in the proper way.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened with much interest to the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio. I concur in what he said. As a matter of fact, we had some desultory discussion on this same subject in the Committee on Rules the other day when the Committee on Armed Services had up its big authorization bill, which will come before the House in a few days. It seems to me that the investigations which now go on relative to the expenditure of these huge sums of money are disorganized in that they are conducted by several committees. I rather hope that those committees which are now conducting independent investigations, many of which necessarily overlap each other, will get together and talk this thing over and see if they could not agree upon some sort of joint select committee that will take over the whole job.

There are three committees that are undertaking to do the very job that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] has been talking about. The Armed Services Committee has a staff. They have a subcommittee, headed by the very able gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT]. They are investigating the expenditure of these funds. The chairman just said, in response to my question a few minutes ago, that the Appropriations Committee had a staff investigating the expenditure of these funds. The regular standing committee for this purpose is the Committee on Expenditures, and they have a staff and a very efficient subcommittee which is also doing the same thing. Necessarily, they overlap. None of these committees, in my judgment, has the type of staff or the size of staff that enables them to do an efficient job. Just think of the huge sums of money that are going to be expended in this effort—\$56,000,000,000—and we are passing it with 1 day of general debate and another day under the 5-minute rule. And that is just 1 year. That is just a starter. Then, the Armed Services Committee now has a bill before the House for authorization for another five or six billion dollars. Then they are coming along with a supplemental appropriation. Incidentally, one of them is for expenditures in the Korean War, which is not included at all in this bill. When you think of these stupendous sums of money and you think of human nature as it is, we all realize there is going to be some money wasted and maybe a little money stolen. Many of these things will not happen if this Congress is keeping an eye on the situation.

I want to say in conclusion I endorse the suggestion made by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], and I hope the committees concerned, namely, the Expenditures Committee, Appropriations Committee, and Armed Services Committee, will get together and see if they cannot agree upon a special committee, composed of members from those three committees, some members at large from the House, and ask for a sufficient staff that will do a real job on this thing, because if you spend a million dollars on a staff to overlook this situation you will save many, many times that much money, if you do not do anything but overlook it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Agreeing with what you say, because I think I am in the same situation as many Members, this seems like a lot of money, but I do not know how much of it is needed. However, is it not true that on the Appropriations Committee the majority party denied us fair representation, so that we are crippled a little right there?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Now the gentleman knows I am not here to indulge in any partisan talk. Whether you got a fair deal in the distribution of committees I am not going into. Aside from that, we should try to inspect the expenditure of these huge sums.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I congratulate the gentleman on what he has said, and I am proud and happy that he has agreed with my general remarks. I am very much pleased that he has included, as I intended to include but neglected to do so, the Expenditures Committee, which also has jurisdiction of the matters being considered.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I hope our joint efforts this morning may bear some fruit with the committees involved.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I can assure the gentleman the members of the committee are just as much interested as is the gentleman in this proposition.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I know you are.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I would like to call your specific attention to this fact: that every dollar that is in this bill has been authorized by this Congress, and you had better start scrutinizing your authorizations before you start picking a fuss with your Appropriations Committee.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I do not know what the gentleman refers to, but my good friend from California and my constituent knows that I would not quarrel with him about anything.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It is not a question of quarreling; it is a question of starting at the premise of the thing. In other words, when you have an authorization for a manpower limitation within your military it becomes incumbent upon the Congress of this country at least to carry out the original authorization, and our scrutiny of what is being effected here should have its inception back at the time these original proposals come before the House.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. What I have said should be of assistance to both the Committee on Appropriations and the Armed Services Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has again expired.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia may proceed for one additional minute to answer a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. May I state that I think both the gentleman from Ohio and the gentleman from Virginia have proposed something which is extremely important.

It is unfortunately true that however conscientious, sincere, painstaking, and thorough may be the effort of the several committees which now are investigating these matters, there is overlapping, there is a loss of effort by shotgun charges. It would be much more effective, result in much greater saving and in more efficiency if such a watchdog committee could be established and be properly staffed to screen and scrutinize constantly all of the tremendous expenditures of Government.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise reluctantly in support of this \$56,000,000,000 defense appropriation bill.

I think the failure of the administration to come forth with a clear-cut American foreign policy has made it necessary for us all to support this bill. We have to support it or give in to communism. The danger we find ourselves today is so great that to oppose this bill would be to court disaster.

Nevertheless, I would like to make a few observations in the short time allotted to me. First, I do not feel the military branches of this Government should be above economy. Hardly a day goes by that I do not receive a letter from a constituent telling of some waste within the military branches, both in manpower and in material. Many of the Reserves who were called into the Armed Forces immediately following Korea have become disillusioned by some of the actions of their superiors. We hear of examples of officers and men who are sitting around in the Army camps with nothing to do. They do not know why they are there and their superiors cannot give a proper explanation. The waste of matériel has been serious enough as evidenced by the report of the Appropriations Committee, but the manpower waste has been a calamity.

A second observation which I consider to be even more alarming is the loss of talent within the Armed Forces. We are losing some of our top military leaders. No one in the Defense Department seems to have an explanation for the loss but, Mr. Chairman, do not you think it is serious when in the first half of 1951 the Defense Department received requests for retirement of 27 Army generals, 22 Navy admirals, and 10 Air Force generals. With the situation as serious as it is in the Far East, we need men like MacArthur and Wedemeyer. But this does not seem to alarm the administration. They apparently want to supplement the best military minds with "yes men."

Mr. Chairman, my third observation will be made in the form of a question. That question is: What are we defending today? Is it an ideal, a way of life, or a system? If the dollar cost, the regimentation, and the militarism of the defense program destroys that ideal, way of life, or system, we end up with nothing to defend.

The cost of this appropriation bill to the people of Nebraska will be about \$500,000,000. To the workers, farmers,

and small-business men of the State this means toil, sacrifice, hardship, and self-denial.

But Nebraskans have sacrificed both in money and lives in all of the recent wars. They will do it again, but they are saying that it is time for us to practice some economy within and without our Defense Establishment so that we can preserve some of the principles that made this the greatest Nation on earth.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the chairman of the subcommittee about some of the detailed matters that are not reflected in the bill or the report. For instance, last year the Army discussed the matter of stockpiling cotton. At that time we had a very short crop and it was with great difficulty that we prevailed upon the Army not to attempt to stockpile cotton from the 9,500,000 bales that were grown last year. This year we have an exceedingly large crop and it occurs to me this would be an excellent time, if the Army cared to stockpile cotton, to do so. I wonder if the gentleman can tell us anything about the intention of the Army in this respect.

Mr. MAHON. I should like to say to the gentleman from Texas that the question of cotton utilization arose during the testimony of General Feldman, Quartermaster General of the Army, as to what should be done about making sure that there is adequate availability of cotton for the Armed Forces. There are funds in the Quartermaster's appropriation to form a duck and webbing pool.

Mr. POAGE. That is a pool of fabricated goods. That is not stockpiling the baled cotton.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct. I should like to read a statement prepared by the Quartermaster General on the 16th of July, this year:

Experience during World War II indicated the necessity of establishing a single stock of certain duck and webbing items for the armed services to be used in the manufacture of truck cover, tarpaulins, tents, cartridge belts, parachute harness, and many other items.

The normal production capacity of the duck and webbing industry for the types used by the armed services is not sufficient to meet the military demands in an emergency. Therefore, the Munitions Board has approved and directed the establishment of a duck and webbing pool.

The establishment of this pool will:

(a) Eliminate competition between the services and between contractors who manufacture items requiring these materials.

(b) Provide a single stock which will be large enough to satisfy emergency needs.

(c) Provide a method of obtaining a greater percentage of production allocation to military orders by presenting consolidated requirements for the Defense Department.

(d) Provide more orderly scheduling of production in order to obtain maximum results.

(e) Provide a secondary saving in transportation cost through shipment in carload lots.

(f) Provide a close control of allocation of critical chemicals needed by manufacturers through over-all scheduling of finished requirements.

(g) Provide a centralized control for the allocation of existing stocks on an equitable basis between the services according to priority of need.

The estimate submitted is to provide a 6 months operating level for the Department of Defense on the following basis, all of which is included in the Army fiscal year 1952 budget estimates:

Army-----	\$177,000,000
Navy-----	35,400,000
Air Force-----	88,500,000

The estimated stock levels are based on anticipated requirements of the three Departments during the mobilization period and through the operation of a revolving fund will enable manufacturers to establish a stabilized production schedule.

I do not believe that actually answers the problem raised by the gentleman, but it does directly relate to it. In view of the fact that the estimates indicate we may have a 17,000,000-bale crop, it would appear there will be a surplus of cotton and now would be a good time for the Army to stockpile cotton within certain reasonable limits.

This would have to be done by the Army or by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. POAGE. The Department of Agriculture has no funds with which to carry on these stockpiling operations. I understand that there are funds in this bill that can be used for stockpiling operations; is that correct?

Mr. MAHON. The stockpiling program, generally speaking, is not in this bill. That comes under the independent offices appropriation bill where we stockpile critical materials. As to whether the language in the pending bill could be interpreted in such a way as to permit the stockpiling of raw cotton, I would have to confer with the attorneys for the Department of Defense. I am not able to answer that question at the moment.

Mr. POAGE. The gentleman draws a distinction between stockpiling to be sure that the national economy has the commodity in existence in case of war, and stockpiling to meet the future needs of the armed services. The armed services do have the authority under this bill to buy the things that they will need.

Mr. MAHON. Yes.

Mr. POAGE. Which will probably include not the raw cotton but the fabrics that the gentleman has discussed.

Mr. MAHON. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. The Quartermaster General has for some time been discussing the possibility of making large purchases of cotton goods, the very goods the gentleman mentioned, and certain other goods, too, shirting, and that sort of thing, but those purchases have not materialized over a long period of months. I know the gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the subcommittee, is as familiar as I am with the

situation that exists in the cotton market today. I wonder if the gentleman might not feel it appropriate as chairman of this subcommittee to call the attention of the military authorities to the fact that now we have the largest potential supply of cotton that we have had in many years, and that now—not next winter, not after the first of the year, but now during the marketing season, if the Army will go into the market now and place their orders for these goods, the military will be able to buy at a lower cost than they can hope to buy at any other time, and at the same time, they will give a stability to the market which will be desirable from every standpoint.

Mr. MAHON. I wish to say that I think the gentleman's suggestion is a good one and I shall be glad to cooperate with the gentleman and take the matter up with the proper officials of the Department of Defense.

Mr. POAGE. Well, I do not want the gentleman to cooperate with me because I do not even know these people. They will not bother with me, but he is the chairman of the committee that holds the money bags. They will be interested in him, they will listen to him, and if he will make a suggestion, it will materialize and get results.

Mr. MAHON. I shall gladly seek an audience with appropriate officials particularly as I represent perhaps the largest cotton-producing congressional district in the United States. I think the suggestion that the gentleman has made is a good one, and we will follow through on this course.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I want to congratulate the gentleman and the other gentleman from the South. You are always on the ball, and I hope the Army will get all the cotton it needs and take care of your crop.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday I received this circular through the mail from an Ohio concern. It shows the picture of Nikolai Lenin, with a quotation from him—and this is a direct quotation—"We shall force the United States to spend itself to destruction." Now, frankly, the way the Communists have worked in this country for the past few years, you know they are encouraging wasteful expenditures. Obviously they are going to keep up this turmoil indefinitely and make us spend as much money as possible. And, we are going to spend it. We have got to spend it. As long as our politicians, who are in top positions, fumble in these international conferences, we are going to be compelled to do what we are doing here today. But, while we are spending this money, unless we spend it wisely, we are just a bunch of suckers. Now here we are appropriating \$56,062,000,000, and according to the testimony of a member of this appropriation subcommittee, there are seven men and only two staff members dealing with an appropriation of \$56,062,000,000. All the members of this subcommittee are fine, upstanding

gentlemen. They are businessmen, lawyers, they are capable, and I know they are thoroughly competent and endeavoring to do a good job. I know the two men they have employed are capable men. But how in the world can you expect nine persons to wrestle with an appropriation of \$56,062,000,000 and come up with the right answer?

One of the members of the subcommittee said that on every occasion when they had members of the military before them at least 10 to 17, members of the military would appear before them to request appropriations.

I want to congratulate the chairman on the fine job he has done. I have no criticism of him. I have no fault to find with his committee. The fault I find is with the Congress of the United States, that it does not provide the proper committees of this House with the funds to carry on the kind of investigations that should be carried on or to check the expenditures as they should be checked.

When the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments was organized it was made up of 14 committees that were merged. Their job was to check all the expenditures. What in the world do you expect when they are not provided with the tool to work with? For example, a subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures went to Detroit the other day. We were in Detroit for 2 days. We sat at least 10 hours each day. We have a very limited staff. We merely scratched the surface, but we found plenty of irregularities in connection with the letting of Government contracts.

Several weeks ago, a special subcommittee of Congress met in Detroit to look at the books. We were checking into the business of the Army's tank-automotive center. As a direct result of our investigation, the man in charge has been removed from office.

I refer to this case because it points up dramatically just what is wrong with our National Government today. The head man here was a graduate of West Point. He had been on the same assignment for four years. When he was questioned on the witness stand, he admitted that he had been a guest of a contractor in Washington six weeks before. He told us he had used Government materials to build two small sailboats. On one occasion, he used an Army truck and its crew to ship trees from Detroit to Maryland. When we asked him why he accepted the hotel accommodation, the officer said, and I quote him: "I couldn't do business without accepting hospitality."

Is it any wonder that youngsters take money to throw basketball games when men in high positions reason this way?

We discovered in Detroit that a business outfit about the size of a small garage managed to charge up \$200,000 for gifts, entertainment, and sales expenses on a government contract. Certainly, no responsible Government official ever went down to look at the place. If anybody had taken a look, he would have blushed redder than a ripe tomato.

If you think these things were bad, what about this? We found here in Detroit that Uncle Sam had handed out

another defense contract to a company that was simply subcontracting all its work to other people. It was acting as a kind of job broker, at the taxpayers' expense.

These things do not just happen by accident. They are the direct result of negligence, indifference or active connivance.

Do not think for a minute that these situations are confined to Detroit or Washington. Within the next few weeks the House of Representatives is going to check up elsewhere. In the third internal-revenue district of New York there have been reports of gross irregularities. Several deputy collectors have been involved in charges of fraud. We have had similar stories in Boston and California.

Within the past few weeks the collector for St. Louis resigned under fire and is now under grand-jury investigation. No one knows how far these probes may reach into the whole back-ground of our industrial community.

Whatever their outcome, they point to the need for a new set of ethical standards in our Government. Ethics and morality have sunk to the lowest level in years, at precisely the moment when they should be at the highest.

I say this because today we are spending billions of dollars of taxpayers' funds. Some of it is simply being thrown down the drain. My office in Washington receives enough Government hand-outs, magazines, publications, and other materials to heat up the Capitol. We have "information specialists" in every department. Their job is to say in 10 words what should be said in 3. In 1 year's time the Pentagon Defense Department and Armed Services Office have added 200 of these paid propagandists to the payroll. We now spend almost \$2,500,000 every year for these folks. I say that most of this is money squandered.

And this is just a drop in the bucket. A few weeks ago I reported that the Army has bought a total of 68,000,000 can openers since the beginning of the Korean War. At the moment we have approximately one and a half million men in the Army. Nobody has talked about more than 3,500,000 men for some years to come. When you divide up the number of can openers by the biggest Army figure we now have, it means about 20 can openers per man.

The same Army folks have bought more than 4,500,000 belts and 11,753,000 pairs of boots. They have enough replacements to last until they rot away.

Do not get the idea that this sort of thing is confined to the Army. Not by any means. In January of this year, our Department of Agriculture was selling surplus butter to Italy at a nice bargain price of 15 cents per pound. At these prices, Italy bought 5,500,000 pounds—probably using our money to do it, too. But at the same time that we were selling this butter, our Army Quartermaster was buying 5,000,000 pounds of oleomargarine and paying 25½ cents a pound for that.

Down in Washington, one of our investigators discovered that a Government agency had made a slight miscal-

ulation on its needs for loose-leaf binders. It has enough on hand now to meet all its requirements for the next 247 years.

As I see these things, they look like something more than just bad business. They are not simply errors in judgment. When you have one example after another of wasted money; when you encounter case after case of people in Government offices accepting "gifts" from the men they are supposed to be dealing with on a business-like basis; when you find scores of officials leaving their jobs in Washington or in the armed services to accept juicy positions in companies for whom they had done "favors"; something is decidedly rotten and it is not in Denmark.

It is about time we cleaned house in Washington. We have been talking about the "hand-out state" for years. That is exactly what has been happening. Too many people have their hands out, expecting something for doing their duty.

You do not build strong nations out of weak characters. It does not seem possible to us that a country as strong as ours can be destroyed. It did not seem possible to the rulers of Rome that their great civilization could be torn down in a few generations by bands of uncouth barbarians. The historians who have analyzed the fall of Rome tell us that it fell because of internal weaknesses, corruption, easy living, immorality in high places.

The analogy to our own times in America is clear enough. We can manufacture the guns and tanks. But the strength and determination to use them wisely must be present if we are to move ahead.

Are we a bunch of saps? It is nothing short of insanity not to provide the regular committees of this House with the funds to carry on investigations of expenditures continuously?

I am a member of the Committee on Expenditures. Since January 1 we have had not over a dozen meetings. We have five or six subcommittees. One of them has an appropriation of \$75,000. Another has an appropriation of \$15,000. They are the authorized committees of this House. They are charged with the responsibility of making these investigations.

I am reminded of the time that I read Mark Twain's book entitled "Innocents Abroad." Mark Twain visited ancient Greece. There he saw the finest bridge he had ever seen in all his life, a most substantial bridge. He asked some of the citizens of Athens about this bridge. They said that on the same spot where this bridge had been erected there had been another bridge erected centuries ago. That bridge had collapsed. The king called out the men who had the contract for the erection of that bridge that had collapsed and called the populace out on a certain day, and he beheaded the whole bunch of those contractors. Then within the same hour that he beheaded these contractors he let a contract for the new bridge. You get the point of that story.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. We in this Congress are, in my opinion, very neglectful, we are very careless when we appropriate billions of dollars and then send a committee out years after a crime has been committed to investigate and apprehend the culprits. The time to check expenditures and the time to check on contractors is when the contracts are let. I was employed for some years as a department store executive. We only did a volume of business of about \$16,000,000 a year. We had 106 buyers; we checked every buyer. If at West Point, they had practiced the same thing they do at all other colleges, we would not have about 100 kids up for dismissal for cheating. Just as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown] pointed out, when you have a traffic policeman you do not have so many speeders. So when you spend this tremendous sum of taxpayers' money which will total this year at least \$60,000,000,000, I say that we should check on such expenditures. Whose money is this? It is the taxpayers' money. Are we as careless about our own personal funds and our own personal expenditures as with the expenditures of all the taxpayers? When we have a Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments that has the authority to subpoena people and the authority to go in and investigate, then we ought to provide them with the tools to work with. I say to you as a member of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments that we have not functioned, that we are not on the job. I do not mean to imply any criticism of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Dawson]. I think the chairman of this committee is one of the finest Members of the House. I think the personnel of our committee is good, but we do not have the tools to work with. While we are passing this bill, which will pass, I am sure, without a dissenting vote—and we should pass the bill because we need the money for defense purposes, there is no question about it—maybe we will need more and maybe we will spend more in order to get rid of this potential foe—I say while we are passing this bill, we can afford to spend \$2,000,000 and give it to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and tell them to go ahead and do a job. A general of the arsenal in Detroit was fired because he was a cheap chiseler. We had a line-up of these purchasing agents up there before our subcommittee. Every one of them was buying things wholesale. There was a fellow who got contracts and he had the run of the place because he got things wholesale for everybody. One fellow got an ice machine wholesale, another got a television set, and another a radio set. That fellow, as a result of this control and his purchasing influence, was able to get contracts for himself. Now, is that not a holler? Are we elected to spend taxpayers' money

foolishly? Or are we here to watch every dollar of the taxpayers' money. It is the responsibility of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments to watch these expenditures. I say it is up to the Congress to provide the money.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we must keep our eye on the ball. The very nature of war is waste, extravagance, and destruction, and assuredly, sir, we are in a state of war. It is said that young men die to preserve peace. I say to you that they die because there is no peace. It is said in the report on this bill that the \$56,000,000 is a measure to preserve peace. I say to you that it is here because there is no peace.

There is but one justification for such a measure and that is it will provide and make possible an armed force of combat efficiency and effectiveness sufficient to destroy our enemy. That enemy is the present Russian Government and the pawns that she moves forcibly and dishonorably.

It is quite natural that politicians want to talk about saving money. I, too, am interested in as effectively and honestly administered a program as is possible. The thing, however, that is more interesting to me is the question of the power that this bill makes possible in behalf of our Armed Forces. It must be measured by that criteria and that alone.

During the past few months I have been alarmed at and ashamed of my country and my Government, the strong, great, and magnificent country that it is, with a good Government which has not placed at the disposal of our commanders in Korea sufficient force and latitude for them to achieve a decisive military victory. I have been ashamed that young men have died to defend this great country and that we have not backed them with a like measure of courage and devotion.

I am not, and no Member of this body is in position to say whether the \$56,000,000 provided in this bill is adequate to produce an armed force competent and sufficient to destroy the present Russian Government. If it does not accomplish that end, then it is not an honest and realistic approach to our present challenge.

Mr. Chairman, it is not the amount of money we spend but the effectiveness with which that money produces military strength which matters now. We are not building the armed services for parade purposes nor for bluffing purposes. We are attempting to build a force that is sufficient to win the present war, an armed force that will result in the downfall of the present Russian Government, for only under such circumstances can we hope for peace.

I, too, fervently desire peace in this world, but there is no peace, Mr. Chairman. There is present at all times the challenge of war. In my judgment it will be so as long as the present gangsters

and hoodlums run Russia and control the pawns throughout the world.

Let us keep our eye on the ball. This is a bill, which if it is worth consideration, will provide and build a fighting armed force. That is the present challenge which this Congress expects this committee to answer. Its effectiveness cannot be measured in the number of men it provides or the number of tanks or ships or airplanes, but in its striking power and its sufficiency to destroy the enemy that engages us in this unfortunate, bloody, and dangerous war. If this measure accomplishes this end, then it is worth many times the fifty-six billions. If it does not, we are being unrealistic and foolish, and perhaps are sacrificing the safety of civilization.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. I think the gentleman is aware that when hostilities come and we really get into war you will spend a billion dollars a day in hostilities.

Mr. LYLE. I say to you that hostilities are not going to break out. They are here. Young Americans are dying this day, not to preserve peace, Mr. Chairman, but because there is no peace. The question is: Does this bill make my country strong enough to destroy—and I use that word advisedly—does it make us strong enough to destroy the enemy? If not, it is not sufficient.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman has posed some very sobering questions. A partial answer is that this bill does not provide sufficient funds to make us strong enough to destroy the enemy.

Mr. LYLE. Then it ought to, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MAHON. The further observation can be made, however, that the Department of Defense, when this current fiscal year ends, will not have expended all the funds we have made available. The Department will still have in excess of \$50,000,000,000 unexpended on June 30, 1952, of the funds provided here and in previous years. In other words, this is a relatively slow build-up, and the American people might as well know the facts of the situation, as I know the gentleman does. The gentleman from Texas and I desire a most rapid and effective build-up.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Lyle] has expired.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. I yield.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I wish to compliment the gentleman on his forceful address. I would like to ask the gentleman, in view of his statement that this whole thing is brought about by the

gangster government in Moscow, with which I agree, whether or not the gentleman does not think it might be better for us to adopt a foreign policy with regard to these gangster governments, that we do not recognize them as legitimate governments, or governments of the people that they enslave; and that we take steps toward an alliance with the peoples who are enslaved by those governments, and assist them in liberating themselves, overthrowing these gangsters who really are not governments, and who require us to spend not only \$56,000,000,000 but endanger the lives of our youth and the youth of the world.

Mr. LYLE. Let me say to the gentleman that is a bigger question than I would like to answer "Yes" or "No." Certainly I think it has a great deal of merit.

Let there be no mistake, Mr. Chairman, Americans desire peace but they are not so foolish as to believe it exists. They would like to be friendly with the good people of Russia and her satellites but they detest the murderous gangsters who enslave those good people under the guise of a government. We are tired of pretense and diplomatic doubletalk. We do not expect to live under the threat of war for a generation or two and to be led by the nose up and down by the whims of Stalin or any other dictator. We are tired of their lying and cheating, their blowing hot and cold. Whether we like it or not, it is our responsibility to bring peace to the world and we are convinced it cannot be done with timidity and sweet talk. The challenge of today demands an armed force of such power that it can destroy our enemy. It appears foolish to me to sit by for generations hoping that it will destroy itself.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman who just preceded me, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE], has raised a serious question, and I think properly so. Maybe I can give him at least part of the answer.

The reason there is no victory yet, and may never be, in Korea, is not due to the lack of the guts or will to fight of the men who are on the ground and in the air and on the sea. You have received and I have received uncounted numbers of letters from these men whose very hearts have been breaking because in what they call a "yo-yo" war they have not been given a chance to go ahead and do the job that they knew they are capable of doing; because the conduct of this war is different from any other; it has been controlled by what have been called agreed politico-military directives.

Let me call your attention to the words of General Vandenberg in the hearings on page 10 where he says this one thing: "Or an aggressive enemy will destroy it on the ground where it is most vulnerable."

He is talking there about his Air Force in war. The Air Force in Korea as yet has not been permitted to destroy the enemy air force where it is most vulnerable, as he says here, on the ground. On another occasion he referred to it

this way, in substance: "It is easier to kill the birds in the nest than when they are on the wing."

Those are among the things that are confusing and puzzling to us as we look back upon the past year of the war in Korea. Men like to know what they are fighting for. When you and I were in combat in war the one thing we were fighting for then was to win the war and bring victory. But somehow or other this does not seem to be now the prevailing goal in Korea. It is a very puzzling situation.

We cannot prepare combat troops or bring victory just with dollars; the mere appropriation of \$56,000,000,000 is not going to win the war or give our soldiers thorough combat training, tough training.

Prior to the outset of the Korean War the training that the men who were going into service received was not the hard type of training that you and I have undergone. Prior to Korea there was not any apparent immediate need for that type of tough training. They were trained as internal police forces only. We have been told, however, by the men who are directing the military training of these men today that they are being given hard, realistic training that will make them not only better fighting men and better able to carry the battle to the enemy. They will be more able to properly take care of themselves out on the battlefield.

Dollars will not do that; there has got to be more than mere dollars. You will find that there is a provision in the bill not only for the training of the men, but also it provides for the equipment that these men will be trained to handle. It is not going to do any good to bring into the Armed Forces a large amount of men if you do not have the equipment available for that training; that would be a waste of manpower. It must be a realistic program.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield.

Mr. LYLE. The gentleman and I agree that there is only one thing important in this bill and that is combat efficiency and effectiveness.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Right, absolutely right. In this bill huge sums are provided for a mobilization reserve of matériel. In other words, we are getting equipment ready to go when and if the need for it comes. We are also getting factories tooled up, ready to turn out equipment at a later date. You are right, unless we do have combat efficiency, providing equipment is futile. Equipment and training in its use give the young Americans a chance to bring victory to us. We have got to have that objective of combat efficiency in mind. I am glad the gentleman brought up that point. It is something all of us and particularly our military leaders, should think about seriously, not only today but tomorrow and in the future.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, we are obliged to watch the United Nations action most care-

fully after we have discovered that the approval of the Charter by the Senate has had the effect of setting aside our State laws. Under the same formula, the Constitution of the United States can be changed by a convention of the United Nations by merely having two-thirds of the Senators present and voting to approve the convention. Forty-nine Senators constitute a quorum, and with this quorum present, if 33 Senators voted for the United Nations law—a convention—it would become the supreme law of this Republic.

What is the complexion of this United Nations? Is it striving to prevent the spread of communism or is it actually at work to build communism? The controlled populations of those members of the United Nations who are actually Communists outnumber the populations of those countries actually opposed to communism. Even in those nations like France and England and many other countries, there is a large section of the population favorable to communism. The conclusion is inescapable, that as to the number of people represented in the United Nations the great majority favor the principles of state ownership as against private enterprise.

When this United Nations Organization was set up, who was the General Secretary; who framed the provisions? A Communist was Secretary and worked 19 days with the committee framing the Charter. It would not be a difficult matter to obtain the names of those assisting this Secretary. Without seeing the names, I can assure anyone that there were many on that committee who, if not Communists, failed to stand up for the principles of this Republic. Lincoln once cataloged men of this stamp when he said:

To sin by silence when they should protest makes cowards of men.

When I see conventions headed toward this country for approval by the Senate, such as the Genocide Convention which seeks to destroy our judicial system and make every citizen's life and liberty subservient to the judicial authority and procedure of the United Nations, I deem it my duty to protest. If it is the desire of communism to destroy this Republic, and I think that is the purpose, it seems that the passage of the Genocide Convention will actually accomplish by indirection what the avowed Communists intend by direct action.

Where an organization like the United Nations is composed of representatives representing a population greater than the opposing populations, it should serve notice on every citizen of this country to scrutinize carefully any proposition on which the United Nations attempts to have passed in this country. Is the administration aware of this situation? I regard President Truman as a true American, but can it be that he has been taken in by the adroitness of the Communist influence in the State Department? Can it be that he is fighting the spread of Russian communism and at the same time condoning the communistic pronouncements emanating from the United Nations?

If this country is doomed to embrace communism, what difference does it make whether Russia accomplishes this purpose or the United Nations gets the credit? The people of this country will defend this Republic—they will defend our institutions and preserve the greatest example of liberty the world has ever seen if they are aware of what is going on. When I became a Member of this Congress I held up my right hand and said:

I, USHER L. BURDICK, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about enter. So help me God.

I meant just what I said in that oath.

By the population complexion of the United Nations; from the fact that one of its conventions has already set aside and annulled the State law of one of our States and will annul other laws as soon as the question is raised judicially; from the fact that the United Nations is attempting to put over the genocide convention and make it the supreme law of this land, destroying our judicial jurisdiction and procedure to protect the public and the accused; their insatiate attitude to meddle with our social and economic life and reduce this Republic to a position of one state among many and destroy the sovereign power of the United States; their demands that laws in all states must conform to the pattern set by the United Nations and by conventions approved by the Senate reach out into the minutest affairs of local self-government and lead me to believe that the United Nations is an enemy of this Republic and I will regard it as such under that oath. I have not reached this conclusion without mature reflection. I have been fair enough to set forth the basis of my belief. If there is anyone in this House who can dispute the basic facts of my statement, he is at liberty to rise now and do so.

The United Nations has never made an out-and-out stand against Soviet communism. Its action has been nothing but a compromise from the first day of its sessions to this hour. When Red China entered the Korean War it was a clear act of aggression that all thinking people admitted, yet it took the United Nations several days, under a lengthy debate, to say that this act was an act of aggression.

Our representative, Warren Austin, was asked "What has been the outstanding accomplishment of the United Nations for peace?" He promptly responded by saying that the resolution branding Red China as an aggressor was the greatest accomplishment. Now, is not that something? Everyone, even the Red Chinese themselves, knew it was aggression, but it took this august United Nations many days and much debate to decide this one simple thing. The reason for that action was due to the fact that representatives in the United Nations have more Communist populations to represent than those who support

capitalism. This organization will always remain a compromise body, because there are too many Communists to pacify.

The Korean stalemate is another example of compromise—we can fight just so much but not too much. We have India to satisfy; we have too many more Communist-dominated countries to satisfy. We cannot wade in and end the war. We can gain no complete victory unless we can shoot down our enemies wherever we find them—but the Communists will not agree to this, so there we are.

It would mean more to the world in stopping the spread of communism if we had two member nations united on stopping it or even ourselves freed from the dead weight of other nations and not try to interfere with local laws of every nation and every state of a nation. Yet we have 60 half-hearted nations trying to stop a thing that the majority believe in themselves. If Red China is finally admitted to the United Nations it will mean 600,000,000 more people backing the Communist idea. It does not require more than a mediocre brain to understand that our playing around with Communists in order to stop communism is self-contradictory. The sooner we pull out of this organization, honey-combed with communism and surrounded by intrigue, the better it will be for not only the United States but the people of the world who seek freedom. We can do more in full faith than we can ever hope to do with a compromised faith which, analyzed, means no faith at all. The first definite and positive thing to do would be to immediately withdraw recognition from Russia or any other country dealing in war materials with Russia.

We should prepare ourselves for defensive warfare and be in readiness to go to the relief of members of the Atlantic Pact where attacked, but under the pact itself we have no business in Western Europe for no one has been attacked by Russia since World War II or a period of over 6 years.

The proposed appropriation of \$8,500,000 for Western Europe is not only unnecessary but another way of spending our substance on a wild-goose chase instead of building our own strength to meet any emergency. If we are not strong, how can we help others?

In spreading communism, Russia will not attack Western Europe for the simple reason that she relies on a less costly program to accomplish the same thing—propaganda, intrigue, and deliberate lies are Russia's ammunition to spread her doctrine. She is arming, not to support her propaganda, but because she is afraid she will, herself, be invaded.

What about the protection of our Pacific bases? If we spend our billions in making ourselves strong in the air and on the sea, Russia, in combination with Red China, has no chance of breaking through and communism cannot spread by military power.

England has already recognized Red China and has used her influence to have us do likewise. Dean Acheson was all set on recommending our recognition

of Red China until General MacArthur blew him out the water. Still the enemies of this Republic are conniving to bring about that recognition. The proposed peace treaty with Japan is a startling example of this intrigue to that recognition. Under the terms of that treaty, the surrender of Formosa is clearly outlined. The terms provide that Japan will have the decision of whether to recognize Red China or Formosa. Japan emerging from war and occupation will want to carry on an extensive trade and she has more chance of trade with Red China than she has with Formosa. What will Japan's decision be? Naturally, she will decide for the greatest amount of trade. In other words, Dulles contrived to avoid our being involved in selling out Nationalist China and hid behind the Japanese to accomplish the same purpose.

If we lose Formosa as a friend by being a party to its delivery to Red China, our Pacific chain of defense will be broken and thousands of lives of American boys will be taken to keep Russia from overrunning the Pacific and putting our western defenses back to the Bay of San Francisco. By keeping Formosa in friendly hands the loss of life to preserve our western defenses will, with a powerful air and sea power, be negligible.

It seems our State Department is hell-bent on seeing communism flourish. President Truman is determined to keep Acheson. Acheson is more responsible for the building and meddling of the United Nations than any person living. He is more responsible than any person living for our becoming embroiled in the mess of foreign entanglements in which we find ourselves today. The attitude of the President keeps Acheson at work.

If we must spend all the money and furnish all the men in stopping the military power of Russia and China, why do we not do it unhampered by a United Nations whose controlled populations exceed the number of out-and-out anti-Communists by 67,000,000, and if Red China is admitted to the UN, the Communist-controlled population represented in the UN will stand at 1,318,100,000, while we and our friends will muster a force of 488,500,000.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. And if we adopt and go along with that and you should talk, after it has been adopted, on the floor here as you have today, you would be tried, if they so willed, where Oatis was tried, and you would be put where he is now.

Mr. BURDICK. I would be tried in Russia, because I have always said that Stalin was a murderer. He has killed 7,000,000 of his own people who disagreed with him.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I think the most conservative estimate on this question is that during the past 30 years this regime has murdered over 40,000,000 of their own people.

Mr. BURDICK. I presume you are correct; I did not go back that far.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. Did they not kill those people before we recognized their form of government; before we picked them up and made them what they are today?

Mr. BURDICK. Yes. I do not know whether or not it would hurt Stalin's feelings if I call him a murderer, but if I did, under the Genocide Convention that this Nation is asked to adopt I am guilty of an offense and would be tried wherever the UN saw fit. Russia would make the complaint. But, when you think of it that in the United Nations today there are more Communist-controlled people represented than anyone else, do you expect to get a clear-cut decision from the United Nations on the Korean War or any other matter of interest to capitalistic countries?

The poet, John G. Hatland, has described the men we need now:

God give us men! A time like this demands
Strong minds, great hearts, true faith, and
ready hands;

Men whom the lust of office does not kill;
Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy;
Men who possess opinions and a will;
Men who have honor—men who will not lie;
Men who can stand before a demagogue,
And damn his treacherous flatteries without
winking

Tall men, sun-crowned, who live above the
fog

In public duty, and in private thinking:
For while the rabble, with their thumb-worn
creeds,

Their large professions and their little deeds,
Mingle in selfish strife, lo! Freedom weeps,
Wrong rules the land, and waiting Justice
sleeps!

(Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE] said there was no peace; that men were dying not to establish peace, but because there was no peace. He has opportunity to correct me if in error. At least, that is my understanding of what he said.

We have no peace, our men are dying because over the years this and the preceding administration—and I do not mean to be political or partisan, but I cannot help it if the facts lead me into a discussion of what has happened—because over the last few years this administration and the preceding one have encouraged and harbored and made use of, in policy-making positions in the executive departments, agents of the Communist governments. Communists such as Nathan Witt, Abt, Lee Pressman, all of whom were Communists, serving Soviet Russia while drawing salaries from the Agriculture Department. Now that is a charge against this and the prior administration. And it is not, it cannot, be honestly denied. Some on this side fought them, exposed them, and for our efforts were charged with disloyalty.

I will go one step further in an effort to be fair about the events which led

to the building up of Soviet Russia. We, on the minority side, have never made the fight against that policy—against the Reds in Government—we should have made, though some of us did our best. We at times have been afraid of and have been silenced by advocates of the administration policy, radio commentators, columnists, and paid propagandists because we were fearful of what they said and what they wrote. Moreover the internationalists in our own ranks have charged us with a lack of charity, narrowness of thought, unwilling to aid needy nations and peoples.

I have had as much to say as anyone, perhaps more, but I am willing, notwithstanding the efforts I have made over the years, to assume my share of the guilt. Perhaps I might have done more though I know not what.

It would be funny; it would be amusing, if it were not so humiliating to read or to listen to the debate we have had on this bill. Everyone seems to acknowledge that in the sum carried there are billions which are not needed, billions that are there because of waste and extravagance or because of inefficiency, if you care to put it that way, or because of our own neglect here in Congress to equip ourselves, to determine for ourselves, whether the figures given us by interested parties are accurate or not.

It certainly is humiliating to read in the RECORD of our own failure, as it is told here from the well of the House, to learn what is needed, to know what we should do. I am at a loss. I do not know what the armed services need. So I must go along, I assume, on the theory that being in the war, and being committed to a policy which I think was wholly unnecessary and which is ruinous, I must nevertheless support it because we are in it. Without my consent, despite my protest and vote, our men are being—have been conscripted to fight in a war not of our choosing—not in our interest. Being in, I cannot deny the funds which are needed to protect them.

But with that attitude should there not go the determination that from this day on I should not—I do not propose to go any further?

I admire the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] and respect his ability. I am sure we all do. I listened to him and I agree with what he said, which was to the effect that Congress should have the means of learning what is or is not needed. But what he said is a bitter indictment of our own negligence, you on that side because you have helped formulate and have supported the policy which has put us into this situation, which you admit threatens war and possible disaster, and we on our side because we have not made a more aggressive fight against your ruinous foreign policy. Why should we not in the days gone by as a party, as a party charged as we are with the responsibility of doing what we can to preserve this Nation, have voted against some of the bills like this one and told the majority to send those bills back to committee, examine again the facts, and then come in with a bill which carried only the

money which was actually needed, which would provide no funds for waste, for extravagance, for spending by the armed services, for items which were wholly unnecessary.

Yes, the blame rests upon all of us. I am telling you here and now that from now on, whether you like it or not, or whatever you have to say about me, I intend not only to vote my convictions as I have tried to do but I intend to do my best to block your program to get us into every war whenever some other nation or the UN may decide a war should be fought to further the ambition of the representatives of other nations or the interest of other nations. I will not, unprotesting, go along with the futile, unsound, ruinous policies of this administration.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I listened with interest to the debate this morning, the remarks made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], and others. These comments seemed to me to point up the feeling of the Members of this House that they have inadequate information about this appropriation.

Yesterday in a colloquy with the gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the subcommittee, I inquired as to the number of staff members of this Appropriations Subcommittee on the defense appropriation bill and was informed that approximately 12 investigators worked for 2 months.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield.

Mr. TABER. I would hardly think there was any such length of time as that with that many people. I would think from all the information I have been able to gather that 1 month and six or seven people would be about right. That was not started until after about the first of May. If it were going to be really effective, it should have been started with the coming in of this Congress—by the first of February.

Mr. MEADER. I thank the gentleman.

This morning I inquired as to the names and the number of investigators for this subcommittee from the clerk of the subcommittee, as well as the Clerk of the House, and the disbursing office. I could not obtain the information. I would suggest to the chairman of this subcommittee that it would be no more than fair to the Members of Congress, and to the people of this country, if he would prepare and insert in the RECORD during this debate the names of every subcommittee investigator, the amount of salary paid, and the number of days or months that he worked on this appropriation bill, and whether they were borrowed personnel, and from what de-

partments they were borrowed. I would like to ask the chairman at this time whether any borrowed investigators were borrowed from the Defense Department itself.

Mr. MAHON. The 11 investigators, who worked about a couple of months on this bill, among others who have worked on it, were, by and large, borrowed from the FBI, the Treasury, Civil Service, and other branches of the Government. None of them was borrowed from the Department of Defense. They were very high-quality personnel. The number working on the assignment was 11, and any statement to the contrary is unequivocally in error.

Mr. MEADER. Would the gentleman have any objection to submitting a tabulation such as I have requested?

Mr. MAHON. May I make another point. One problem involved and one of the difficulties involved in investigations insofar as assigning investigators permanently, let us say to Army, Navy, or the Air Force budget, is that they are thrown in close association and are with them day in day out, and year in and year out. They establish a sort of entente cordiale. There is a tendency for friendships to grow up and for the investigators to look at problems through the eyes of the military, or through the eyes of whatever establishment is being investigated. This would not involve any willful wrong doing.

Mr. MEADER. Would it not be more likely for the entente cordiale to be established where the personnel is borrowed than where they are hired by and under the control of the committee?

Mr. MAHON. I would say that the danger is both ways. It is one of those problems that you always have. I will be glad to supply the gentleman with what information is available in the office of the Committee on Appropriations. I do not have it at hand at the moment with respect to personnel.

Mr. MEADER. Will the gentleman insert this information in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that other Members of the House and the public generally will have an idea of the help that this committee had?

Mr. MAHON. The investigators of the Committee on Appropriations come under the jurisdiction of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], chairman of the committee, and it is through his office that they are employed. I believe it would be more proper if the gentleman made the request of him rather than of me. He has the records and the responsibility in the matter.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to refer to a matter which illustrates how necessary it is that we have the details. It is described in an article in the Detroit News of July 12, 1951. I will ask permission in the House to insert this article in the RECORD in its entirety. It deals with a trip taken by 20 European editors to visit Detroit war plants. The trip turned out to be absolutely worthless, if not actually detrimental, to the interests of the United States.

The article is as follows:

RED TAPE PUTS CRIMP IN EUROPEANS' VISIT—JOURNALISTS COMPLAIN THEY DID NOT SEE PRODUCTION IN "ARSENAL OF DEMOCRACY"

(By John J. Najduch)

Twenty European journalists and radio commentators, representing American allies in the North Atlantic Treaty, left Detroit today still not convinced the United States is serious in its defense-rearming program.

The failure to convince them was attributed to the Defense Department, which brought the visitors for the express purpose of showing them American firepower and military production centers and then disappointed them.

Before coming to Detroit, the 20 were taken to Quantico Marine Base, Va.; Fort Benning, Ga., and Eglin Air Force Base, Fla. They were impressed there by the firepower of American forces and then were brought to Detroit to see where the firepower was produced.

Instead the group was taken on a tour of civilian-car production centers, historical sights, the All-Star ball game, and a round of dinners, lunches, and cocktail parties.

DUTCHMAN COMMENTS

The visitors became so disgusted at one point of the Detroit trip that only five of the group showed up at one civilian plant.

Finally, on Wednesday, the third day of their tour, after the Europeans protested, the Defense Department escorts took them to the Detroit tank arsenal.

This tour of the tank arsenal did not satisfy the visitors, because, they explained, it was a full-time Government plant and was not the same as a privately owned plant turning out munitions and not peacetime products.

Andries Ekker, political correspondent for Het Parool and De Nieuw Pers in the Netherlands, in a dispatch to his newspapers expressed his disappointment.

WHERE ARE THE BULLETS?

"How can I tell the people of my own country," he said, "that we should be cutting down our own civilian production and lowering our own standard of living, when nowhere did I see the Americans producing for war?"

"We're willing to live up to our obligations, if the Americans can convince us they are likewise willing to live up to theirs. There are still many cars rolling off the lines but not a bullet did I see."

Povl Westphall, editor of the Berlingske Tidende in Denmark, explained "We were anxious to come to this country to learn about American efforts. We expected to see defense production, but we got a surprise." He added, "We have to realize that it will be a long time before it is a reality."

RED TAPE BLAMED

This feeling was contained in the reports from the rest of the visitors.

They were enthusiastic about the sight-seeing tour, declaring that it was the best they could ever hope to take, but would have preferred a business tour.

Local observers could name a dozen, civilian plants within a half-hour drive from the Fort Shelby Hotel, the visitors' headquarters in Detroit, where they could have seen military equipment coming off the lines, if prior clearance had been made.

A State Department escort blamed the Defense Department for failing to permit such a tour and giving proper clearance. The Defense Department said red tape was responsible.

WASHINGTON DECIDES

The Detroit Board of Commerce, which played host to the visitors, tried to take the visitors on a tour of defense-production centers but received no assistance from Washington.

Altogether there were eight Army and Navy officers accompanying the visitors and

two State Department officials. In addition, crews of two Government planes were on hand waiting to take them on the next leg of their journey to New York.

In addition to the board of commerce expenses, the Detroit visit cost the Government an estimated \$5,000. The 1-month tour may cost \$50,000.

GERMANS PLEASED

The visitors likewise were disgusted with several of their escorts. One of the escorts went swimming, leaving the journalists under his care to find their own way to the All-Star ball game.

Another escort was inebriated during the entire trip.

The visitors included 11 German journalists. From their standpoint, the tour was successful since the human side of American production was emphasized.

Mr. Chairman, it was my privilege, as a guest of the Detroit Board of Commerce, to participate in one afternoon's activities of this group of European editors in Detroit. It consisted of cruising up and down the Detroit River, which consumed the greater part of a Sunday afternoon. I can personally attest to the accuracy of the article regarding the conduct of some of the escorts for this group of editors. In fact, I am informed that the conduct of some of the escorts was such that the European editors felt it necessary to apologize to their Detroit hosts for the conduct of their escorts from the Department of Defense.

The reason that I have referred to this article is because this is one concrete instance of the expenditure of public funds by the Department of Defense concerning which I would like to have a great deal more information.

I was informed that this visit of the 20 European editors, in which they toured various areas of the United States, was only one of six such junkets arranged by the Public Relations Office of the Department of Defense. I would like to know how much money these—and similar junkets—cost the taxpayers. I would like to know more details about the purpose of such activities. Certainly if the purpose of the particular tour referred to in the Detroit news article was to gain good will for the United States and to convince these foreign editors that the United States was making an all-out effort for rearmament, the Detroit visit was a total loss. The reason it was a total loss was because the Washington agencies failed to obtain clearance for these editors to visit any defense plants in Detroit, although the necessity of doing so had been called to their attention long in advance of the trip to Detroit.

If this visit was solely for the purpose of providing an interesting tour for a certain selected group of foreigners, I question the propriety of financing such a tour at the expense of the American taxpayer. I doubt that there are very many Americans who would not like to make a tour of Europe or other parts of the world, but it is wholly improper to satisfy such desires out of public funds. There must be a definite and palpable relation to the interests of the United States Government before such travel can be justified as a public expenditure.

There is another aspect of the matter which is of considerable interest to me. Since this program appears to have

emanated from the Public Relations Office of the Department of Defense, I am interested in whether or not public funds in this instance, or in other similar instances, will be used to further political and ideological objectives of the executive branch of the Government.

I wonder whether the media of communication, the press, the radio and television, are being granted favors out of funds appropriated for military purposes with the objectives of creating a sympathetic acceptance for the philosophy of those whose sole duty is to carry out policies enacted by the Congress.

These and other questions concerning this single episode indicate how important it is that the committees of Congress should have investigators capable of finding out the truth about these public activities.

Probably the entertainment and travel provided at the expense of the Defense Department is a comparatively insignificant item when viewed in the perspective of total appropriations of \$56,000,000,000. However, the underlying principle is applicable to the entire appropriation; namely, that the budget request should be challenged and screened independently by the Congress. The Congress should be able, in fact, to defend before the American people the amounts they have authorized to be spent in the appropriation bills.

I think it is a shame that the debate on this \$56,000,000,000 appropriation bill will end without the true facts appearing in the RECORD with respect to the staff this appropriations subcommittee has had at its disposal. The chairman of the subcommittee claimed there were 11 or 12 investigators who worked there about 2 months. An informal inquiry this morning indicated that there were 15 such investigators. The ranking minority member the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has stated that there are only six or seven investigators who

worked about 1 month. I think the true facts should be in the RECORD for the benefit of the Congress and the American people.

Whatever figure is right, however, it seems to me that the staff of this appropriations subcommittee is wholly inadequate. I repeat the charge I made yesterday that the responsibility for the weakness of the Congress, the weakness of its committees because of their inability to master the facts of the problems with which they deal, is solely and exclusively the responsibility of the majority leadership of this House.

The Clerk read as follows:

RETIRED PAY

For retired pay and retirement pay, as authorized by law, of military personnel on the retired lists of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and the Air Force, including the reserve components thereof; and retainer pay for personnel of the inactive Fleet Reserve; \$345,000,000.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VAN ZANDT: Page 4, line 22, before the period at the end thereof insert a colon and the following new matter: "Provided, That no part of such sum shall be used to pay the retired or retirement pay of any member of the regular Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Air Force who is retired after the date of enactment of this act, unless such member was retired because of (1) being unfit to perform the duties of his office, rank, grade, or rating by reason of a physical disability incurred in line of duty, or (2) achieving the age at which retirement is required by law."

(Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, this amendment I have offered is designed to stop the retirement pay of members of the Armed Forces for other than physical disability or statutory age.

You have read in the papers during the past several months about admirals and generals at the age of 47, 49, 50, and 52, who have been retired from the armed services, because they have not been selected for promotion, or they disagree with the policy of their superiors. Upon retirement they generally go into civilian life and accept employment with private industry at a lucrative salary.

The situation is simply this: The American taxpayer spends \$30,000 educating the average officer of the Armed Forces, and when he retires he retires generally on three-quarters pay. Someone has to take his place, so instead of one man filling that job there are two men filling the job; one on active duty and the other retired. Therefore, the cost of that of is increased by adding the retired pay to that of the person on active duty.

My amendment simply means that no portion of this appropriation can be spent to pay retirement benefits to any officer or enlisted man who retires from the armed services for reasons other than physical disability or age. You will save a million dollars a year by this amendment and you will not impair the efficiency of our Armed Forces. In fact, you will increase their efficiency by keeping these admirals, generals, and others on active duty for the duration of this emergency.

During the 8 months beginning June 25, 1950, up until March 1 of this year, 1,914 officers and enlisted men were retired for reasons other than physical disability. The additional cost to the American taxpayer for that 8 months was \$605,000. For a period of a year, the cost of these retirements will approximate a million dollars.

At this point, I wish to make a part of my remarks a chart showing the number of officers and enlisted men retired during the first 8 months of the Korean War and the cost to the taxpayers:

Officers and enlisted men retired from armed services on statutory age and length of service, June 25, 1950–Mar. 1, 1951

Pay grade	Rank	Army	Navy	Marines	Air Force	Active-duty pay per month	Retired pay per month	Total of both active-duty and retired pay	Total	Total active-duty pay	Total retired pay
08.....	Rear admiral ¹		12								
	Major general.....	10			2	\$954.75	\$716.06	\$1,670.81	24	\$22,914.00	\$17,185.44
07.....	Rear admiral ²		1	1							
	Brigadier general.....	27			2	826.50	619.88	1,446.38	31	25,621.50	19,216.28
06.....	Captain.....		131								
	Colonel.....	229		5	20	698.25	523.98	1,222.23	385	268,826.25	201,732.30
05.....	Commander.....		11								
	Lieutenant colonel.....	111		2	5	584.25	438.19	1,022.44	129	75,368.25	56,526.51
04.....	Lieutenant commander.....		24								
	Major.....	87		6	22	513.00	384.75	897.75	139	71,309.00	53,480.25
03.....	Lieutenant.....		4								
	Captain.....	49		3		411.75	331.31	743.06	54	22,234.50	17,890.74
02.....	Lieutenant (junior grade).....		1								
	First lieutenant.....	12		1		349.13	261.85	610.98	14	4,887.82	3,665.90
01.....	Ensign.....										
	Second lieutenant.....	3				313.50	235.13	548.63	3	940.50	705.39
W4 and 3.....	Commissioned warrant.....	12	1	14	1	465.60	349.20	814.80	28	13,036.80	9,777.60
W2 and 1.....	Warrant.....	13		1	12	349.20	261.90	611.10	26	9,079.20	6,809.40
E7.....	Chief petty officer.....		70								
	Master sergeant.....	315		39	281	294.00	220.50	514.50	705	207,270.00	155,452.50
E6.....	Petty officer, first-class.....		3								
	Sergeant, first-class.....	92		6	38	249.90	187.89	437.79	139	34,736.10	26,116.71
E5.....	Petty officer, second-class.....		2								
	Sergeant.....	90		6	60	227.85	170.89	398.74	156	35,544.60	26,658.84
E4.....	Petty officer, third-class.....		1								
	Corporal.....	38		4	1	191.10	143.33	334.43	44	8,408.40	6,306.52
E3.....	Seaman.....										
	Private, first-class.....	17		1	2	147.00	110.25	257.25	20	2,940.00	2,205.00
E2.....	Seaman.....										
	Private.....	17				120.00	90.00	210.00	17	2,040.00	1,530.00
E1.....	Seaman.....										
	Private.....										
Total.....						5,951.93	5,045.11	11,740.89	1,914	805,156.92	605,247.38

¹ Upper half.

² Lower half.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEARNEY. While I am in great sympathy with the gentleman's amendment, I would like to ask the gentleman if he thinks this amendment would apply to those under retirement for years of service, regardless of age.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. You mean retired for 30 years of service?

Mr. KEARNEY. Yes.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Yes. It definitely will. It will make it mandatory that they stay in the service for the duration of the present emergency.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the committee will approve this amendment.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. PATTERSON. Will the gentleman tell the committee exactly what his amendment would do?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I can use an illustration. For instance, a general has 30 years of service and he applies for retirement. He may be at the age of 47. If his application for retirement is accepted, he will be retired on three-quarters pay. My amendment will not permit the services to spend any money toward the retirement pay of that individual. Therefore, it is assumed that the services will not retire the gentleman who makes application on account of 30 years of service.

Mr. PATTERSON. That would be exclusive of physical disability?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That would be exclusive of physical disability. If he has reached the statutory retirement age of 64, he must retire.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The Congress is not at all hesitant about extending the periods of service for those draftees whom it has taken into service?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Certainly not. We violated our contract with the enlisted men when we extended his enlistment on two different occasions for a period of 12 months.

Mr. DONDERO. And the reservists as well.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That is correct.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Does not the President at the present time have discretion as to whether or not he will authorize the retirement of an officer after 30 years of service?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Definitely so. Congress passed the bill several weeks ago giving to the Secretary of the Navy the right to stop certain retirements if he wished to, but it appears that neither the Secretary nor the President are keeping these men who are trained and experienced in the service so that the American people can receive benefit from their efforts during the present emergency.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Would the gentleman's amendment provide for these officers who have not been selected for promotion and thus wish to retire, and also that they become extra numbers in grade so that it will not impede the orderly flow of promotions?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. My amendment provides that these officers shall be carried as extra numbers and, therefore, their retention on active duty will not impede the usual flow of promotions.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania may proceed for two additional minutes that I may ask him a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. The gentleman's amendment only hits future retirements.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That is right; it does not affect in any way, shape, or form any of the benefits received by those who have retired prior to this bill becoming a law. It means that effective that date officers and enlisted men cannot be retired for reasons other than physical disability or statutory age requirement.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Is there a limitation as to how long this prohibition shall remain in operation?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. For the duration of the emergency.

Mr. DEVEREUX. For the duration of the emergency as we understand it to be.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Yes. If this amendment is adopted we will follow the same practice during this emergency that we followed during World Wars I and II.

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman will yield, this could be applicable only to the funds provided in this bill anyway.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That is understood, and we would have to renew this limitation on the expenditure of funds for the next fiscal year.

The retirement list contains hundreds of duly qualified and experienced personnel whose services could be utilized at small cost to the Government. Yet the Army has recalled to active duty only 404 retired personnel, the Navy and Marine Corps 96, and the Air Force only 6. Meanwhile, of the 1,975 retired for other than physical reasons or on age, 991 were in the Army, 452 Navy and Marine Corps, and 532 in the Air Force.

It should be kept in mind that the retirement of military personnel often requires the calling up of Reserves to fill such vacancies. In many instances retirement has been mandatory because an officer failed to be selected for promotion. For example, a Navy captain was forced to retire recently at the age of 51 because he failed to be selected for promotion to rear admiral. His pay at the time of retirement was \$860.25 monthly and after being retired he received \$523.68 as his retirement pay each month, and will continue to receive that sum for the rest of his life.

The Navy captain is a graduate of the United States Naval Academy and his education cost the American taxpayers approximately \$30,000. In addition to the experience he received while in naval service he also had attended several post-graduate schools that added another \$10,000 to the taxpayers bill for his education.

As a replacement for the retired Navy captain, a reserve commander was called from civilian life and added to the Federal payroll with a base pay of \$689.25 monthly. Now we have the retired captain and the reserve commander both on the payroll at a combined monthly salary of \$1,213.23. In other words, before retirement the Navy captain was filling his assignment at a rate of \$860.25 monthly and in a more efficient manner because of his education and experience. Today the filling of his billet has resulted in adding another name to the payroll with the net result that the retirement of the Navy captain is costing the taxpayers an additional \$523.68 monthly. This is only one of many similar instances where the taxpayers' money is being wasted.

On May 14, I called to the attention of the House that from July 1, 1950 to March 1, 1951, 1,914 persons were retired from the Armed Forces for other than physical reasons. I submitted a table showing that the total cost of their services while on active duty amounted to \$805,156.92 monthly, and that their retirement pay for the 8-month period amounted to \$605,247.38.

If my amendment is adopted, you can readily realize that a saving to the taxpayers will result because duly qualified military personnel will be retained on duty unless retired on physical disability or through achieving the age at which retirement is required by law. In the 8-month period cited the American taxpayers would have been saved the retirement pay of \$605,247.38 if the provisions of my amendment were in effect.

Mr. Chairman, it is recognized that Congress as a whole is conscious of the absolute need for economy, not alone in nonessential Government expenditures, but also in the military budget when reductions can be made without impairing the National Defense program.

I feel certain that the adoption of my amendment is in the interest of real economy. At the same time, it will strengthen our National Defense by retaining on active duty during the present emergency, experienced and duly qualified personnel of the Armed Forces, whose forced retirement at this time for other than physical reasons or having achieved the age at which retirement is required by law, is proving a costly expenditure to the American taxpayers.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we could have an agreement as to time for debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto?

I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes, the last 4 to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER] is recognized.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, if the members of the Committee will turn to page 9767 of the proceedings of yesterday, they will find in the lower left-hand column of that page my discussion of this matter of the retirement of these high-ranking military men with long years of experience. Many of them have just come to the point where they can make a great contribution to our national military effort. I stated yesterday that I felt that the practice should be curtailed sharply until this emergency is over; that these men should be retained in service where we could receive the benefit of their experience and training. As has been said, if we can compel young men from civilian life to serve longer than their contract of enlistment, then these men trained at Government expense can well be retained until the need for their services is over.

This proposed amendment will accomplish exactly the goal that I proposed yesterday; and, naturally, Mr. Chairman, I shall support the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NICHOLSON] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, I, too, hope that we accept this amendment. It should go further than it does. In the last couple of decades we have been kind of making a baby out of this Army and Navy and defense force. After 1949 we had 450 generals, that is from brigadiers to full general. I have never taken the trouble to ascertain how many admirals we had in the Navy or how many generals we had in the Air Force and Marine Corps. We have twice as many as we need. If there is any reason why we should retire men at three-quarters pay who are only 48, 49, or 50 years old, I would like to know that reason. Everyone else in the Government service has to be 65 before they can retire.

Mr. Chairman, back in the old Spanish-American War days, as I remember it, we had three admirals. Now we have eight full generals in the Army. I do not know how far we are going with this kind of stuff. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] called attention to the civilian personnel falling all over themselves. It is the generals who are falling all over themselves, not the civilians.

While it may not mean anything, we have to vote for this bill, but we should start thinking and should endeavor to stop this building up, building up, building up of the military in this country. Due to the propaganda they put out and the scare lines they put out, plus everything else they indulge in, they try to make the people of the country afraid, and this situation should stop.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLSON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. The gentleman says we have got to vote for this bill. Does he say that because we have taken on the job of defending the world, and it

is a pretty big job? If we would limit this to defending ourselves maybe we would not have to vote for this bill.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I intend to vote for it. I am not voting for any aid to Europe or Asia or anybody else, but we have this \$60,000,000,000 here for our own defense. It is too much, without adding eight or ten billion more for aid to Europe.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I turn to page 7 of the report to read one brief paragraph about retired pay:

The appropriation request for "Retired Pay" in the amount of \$360,000,000 is to provide for pay of military personnel on the retired lists of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force. Information before the committee indicated that the appropriation request for fiscal year 1951 was overestimated. More retired personnel are being called back into service, which should reduce the requirements, and in the opinion of the committee more careful scrutiny should be given to requests for retirement of persons who have not reached the legal age limit for retirement. On the basis of these facts and on past experience the committee recommends a reduction of \$15,000,000 in this request, leaving for appropriation \$345,000,000.

In other words, the committee has already taken action that seems appropriate in order to discourage retirement of military personnel. There is a tendency that is rampant in this country for people to shift the responsibility and duty which is theirs to somebody else, but I think we should each stand on our own two feet and do that which we are called upon to do as Representatives of the people.

The Committee on Armed Services of which the gentleman from Pennsylvania is a member has jurisdiction over legislation of this type. His proposal is a legislative provision, and I understand exhaustive hearings are being held by his committee. With this bill, as big as it is, it seems to me that this is not the time to have a shot gun amendment of this kind.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KILDAY. I would like to remind the gentleman from Texas that in the last Congress the Committee on Armed Services for the first time since 1908 revised the provisions of law with reference to pay and retirement. It was based upon a recommendation of the report of the Hook Commission which went into the matter exhaustively for a period of over 18 months. We wrote a bill and brought it in here. It was recommitted. We rewrote it to satisfy the Congress, and it was passed. All elements were considered. I understand that complaint was raised because men were retired before the statutory age based on physical disability. That is based on a percentage of $2\frac{1}{2}$ percent times the years of service. The gentleman from Massachusetts said they retired at 75 percent. That is no longer correct. He can only get 50 percent with 20 years of service. Physical disability retirement is now based on a

percentage as graded by the Veterans' Administration. I insist that this is not the time or the manner to change a law that was so carefully considered by a commission and the Congress.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman for his sound and helpful suggestions. It would be utterly ridiculous, without adequate hearings, to change the law of the land. I like to feel that the military leaders who have retired have done so for good and sufficient reasons and that if we should become involved in a global war they would gladly return to the uniform. Of course, American mothers would not want their sons to fight under the leadership of an officer who was not willing to give his best energies to the Government and this country in time of extreme emergency. After all, the laws which Congress has passed make retirement under certain circumstances perfectly legal.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Did the gentleman approve this policy in World War I and World War II?

Mr. MAHON. I am not saying what we did in World War II or World War I. I say that today we do not want to write legislation without adequate consideration which belongs to his committee. Let the gentleman take action on the matter in his own committee and bring out appropriate legislation.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, as to whether we did this in World War I, every man who served in World War I under the law was entitled to retire with 75 percent if he had as much as 20 years' service.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. VAN ZANDT) there were—ayes 47, noes 41.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. MAHON and Mr. VAN ZANDT.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 81, noes 71.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

EXPEDITING PRODUCTION

To enable the Secretary of the Army, without reference to section 3734 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and to section 1136 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (except provisions thereof relating to title approval), to expedite the production of equipment and supplies for the Army for emergency national defense purposes, including all of the objects and purposes specified under each of the appropriations available to the Department of the Army during the current fiscal year, for procurement or production of equipment or supplies, for erection of structures, or for acquisition of land; the furnishing of Government-owned facilities at privately owned plants; the procurement and training of civilian personnel in connection with the production of equipment and material and the use and opera-

tion thereof; and for any other purposes which in the discretion of the Secretary of the Army are desirable in expediting production for military purposes, \$1,000,000,000.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order, on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill, against the language beginning in line 4 of page 7, and ending in line 6, and reading as follows: "and for any other purposes which in the discretion of the Secretary of the Army are desirable in expediting production for military purposes."

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I am not prepared to say that the language is subject to a point of order. I doubt, however, that the language is necessary. I have no serious objection to the language being stricken from the bill, but I do not want to concede that the language is subject to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Can the gentleman refer the Chair to any specific law with reference to this language?

Mr. MAHON. I do not have the language of the basic legislation before me, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of the opinion that it is legislation on an appropriation bill and therefore is subject to the point of order. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

For expenses necessary for equipping, maintaining, operating, and training the Army National Guard, including expenses of camps, airfields, storage facilities, buildings, structures, rifle ranges, and facilities, the purchase (not to exceed 100) and hire of passenger motor vehicles for official use only, and the modification, repair, maintenance, and operation of airplanes; transportation of things; personal services in the National Guard Bureau and services of personnel of the Army National Guard employed as civilians (without regard to their military rank) necessary for the care, maintenance, modification, and repair of materials and equipment, for Federal property and custodial accounting work, and for administrative and such other duties as may be required; medical and hospital treatment of members of the Army National Guard who suffer injury or contract disease in line of duty and other expenses connected therewith as authorized by law; pay at a rate not less than \$2,400 per annum and travel of property and disbursing officers for the United States; travel expenses (other than mileage), at the same rates as authorized by law for Army National Guard personnel on active Federal duty, of Army National Guard division and regimental commanders while inspecting units in compliance with National Guard regulations when specifically authorized by the Chief, National Guard Bureau; attendance of Army National Guard personnel at military service schools; drill pay of the Army National Guard; subsistence for drills of eight or more hours duration in any one calendar day; expenses of temporary duty travel of personnel of the Regular Army in connection with activities of the Army National Guard; procurement and issue to the Army National Guard of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia of military equipment and supplies, as provided by law, including motor-propelled vehicles and airplanes; and expenses of repair, modification, issue, maintenance and use of supplies, material and equipment, and such property may

be furnished from Army stocks without reimbursement subject to recall for Army requirements; \$202,982,000, to remain available until June 30, 1953: *Provided*, That the number of caretakers authorized to be employed for any one unit or pool under the provisions of section 90 of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, as amended, may be such as is deemed necessary by the Secretary of the Army.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to call to the attention of the committee a matter which I do not think should be overlooked. In the provision of funds for caretakers and administrative assistants for the Army National Guard, we have provided the amount of money requested by the Army and the Bureau of the Budget. But that funds is \$2,900,000 less than the representatives of the National Guard Bureau and the National Guard Association feel is essential for the proper care and supervision of their equipment, and for the various administration requirements of the National Guard. The committee did not put in the additional money which was requested. I asked the Bureau of the Budget 2 weeks ago to provide me with more detailed information on their reasons for eliminating that \$2,900,000 before the bill came to Congress. Despite the fact that my request was made 2 weeks ago, and despite the assurance that the information would promptly be forthcoming, I do not yet have the information. It is my understanding that the cut was made on the assumption that the National Guard with many of its units and much of its personnel now in Federal service, would require fewer caretakers and administrative assistants. However, the evidence which has been made available to me indicates this is not the case.

The National Guard Association and the National Guard Bureau feel that this cut is too deep and that we shall run into trouble, in that the Guard will not have personnel sufficient to properly look after the costly and essential equipment.

I call this to the attention of the committee because we may be making a mistake in not providing additional funds in this instance.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEARNEY. Is it not also true that at this particular time the National Guard has more officers and men than it has ever had in the history of this country, and these funds are absolutely necessary?

Mr. SIKES. I share the gentleman's feeling in the matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I have not heretofore taken any time on this bill. As I have listened to the debate today and yesterday the thought kept crossing my mind, Why is it necessary that we add this additional crushing burden on the backs of the American people? What is behind all this appropriation of vast sums of money? Why must we stand here in the well of this House and raise these

questions in trying to protect our country and the American people.

The answer comes back: "Because we are trying to contain communism around this world," or "Because we are in fear that we will become engaged in war with Russia."

How did it happen that Russia has become such a formidable power as to threaten the peace of the world? Well, we recognized that Government sometime in 1933 or 1934, but on September 9, 1928, 5 or 6 years before we recognized that Government, then a tottering regime, which gave it prestige and power all over this world. Here is what Pravda, a Russian newspaper, said to say in regard to what Russia and its Communist regime proposed to do; yet in the face of this statement our Government, through the New Deal, was unwise enough to give them official recognition in the family of nations. I quote:

The world-wide nature of our program is not mere talk, but an all-embracing and blood-soaked reality.

Notice "blood-soaked reality."

It cannot be otherwise. Our ultimate aim is world-wide communism, our fighting preparations are for world revolution, for the conquest of power on a world-wide scale and the establishment of a world proletarian dictatorship.

How can we justify the action we took in the face of a statement like that, giving notice to the civilized world that their program was to destroy every other government on the face of the earth and set up world revolution and world communism?

But that is not all. Stalin had this to say about the same time, and I quote him:

The dictatorship of the proletariat is the most determined and the most ruthless war waged against the bourgeoisie.

That is the free world today.

The proletarian state is an instrument for the suppression of the bourgeoisie.

The dictatorship of the proletariat is a revolutionary power based on violence against the bourgeoisie. To put it briefly: The dictatorship of the proletariat is the domination of the proletariat over the bourgeoisie, untrammelled by law and based on violence.

Since those statements were uttered, this country and this Government through the Fair Deal Administration has sheltered, shielded, and protected Communists here in our own Government. Communism has been appeased both at home and abroad. We have seen nothing but a policy of appeasement of Russia and her satellites especially since the last World War or what we know as World War II. We all remember and shall never forget Yalta, Tehran and Potsdam. That policy of appeasement by the present administration is present even in the resolution that may come before the House again this afternoon. I refer to the Oatis resolution which is only a mild slap on the wrist of Czechoslovakia for arresting and jailing one of our Associated Press correspondents who was determined to uphold the right of freedom of the press in this country.

That policy of appeasement has simply done nothing but encourage aggression and greater aggression against us and

the civilized world. The result is that today we stand here in this House to further burden the American people with another \$56,000,000,000 on top of their already crushing burden of taxation that is sapping the life blood out of our country. In 12 months the House has passed three tax bills which has added \$17,000,000,000 in new taxes on the American taxpayer.

How long can we continue before utter collapse becomes the unhappy fate of our country? And when we go down what other country will remain in this world to stop communism anywhere or stand up for free people?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I congratulate the gentleman for his eloquent words. The gentleman will recall that in the negotiations to recognize Soviet Russia in the fall of 1933 the precise purpose mentioned in the letter of President Roosevelt to the President of Russia was stated as being to permit the peoples of the United States and the peoples of Russia to communicate with one another. Since that time there has been less communication, there has been no communication, whereas before we recognized them there was substantial communication between these peoples.

Mr. DONDERO. The gentleman is correct; I thank him for his contribution. Certain it is that we cannot long remain a solvent government if this program of spending all over the world continues. Collapse and the loss of our heritage of freedom will soon be our tragic fate.

(Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 4, line 22 to correct a printing error. There is some confusion as to the amount. The amount is \$345,000,000. The second set of three figures is set off by a period instead of a comma; in other words, it should read "\$345,000,000."

I ask unanimous consent that the figure be amended to read correctly.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY

For pay, allowances, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, clothing, permanent change of station travel (including expenses of temporary duty between permanent duty stations), and transportation of dependents, as authorized by law, for regular and reserve personnel on active duty (except those on active duty while undergoing reserve training), \$2,456,475,000.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas is recognized.

(Mr. SCRIVNER asked and was given permission to revise and extend the various remarks he has made today.)

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, on yesterday there was some discussion about the President's yacht, the *Williams-*

burg, the Navy vessel that is set aside for the use of the President. A question was raised as to how the food consumed by the President and his guests was procured, and from what funds. I am informed by the Assistant Director of the Budget for the Navy that the President has a separate mess aboard the *Williamsburg*. He buys his food and pays the regular prices, which are the same as those paid for food in the officers' mess for the items desired. This cost of this food is paid from the President's own personal fund.

As far as the expenses of the men and officers on board the *Williamsburg* are concerned, their rations are taken care of just as other naval rations and expenses are taken care of.

There was a question raised as to the expenses for the plane *Independence*. The pay of the crew, the expenses for maintaining and operating the plane comes from Air Force appropriations. As in the case of the *Williamsburg*, some of the incidental expenses are paid from White House funds. However, it is impossible to inform the House as to those items or the amounts.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONSTRUCTION OF AIRCRAFT AND RELATED PROCUREMENT

For construction, procurement, and modernization of aircraft and equipment, including ordnance, spare parts, and accessories therefor; expansion of public and not to exceed \$100,000 for expansion of private plants, including the land necessary therefor, without regard to section 3734, Revised Statutes, as amended, and such land, and interests therein, may be acquired and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title by the Attorney General as required by section 355, Revised Statutes, as amended; procurement and installation of equipment in public or private plants; and departmental salaries necessary for the purposes of this appropriation, to remain available until expended, \$4,000,000,000, of which \$450,000,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred under authority heretofore granted to enter into contracts for the foregoing purposes.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to correct an error in the printing of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MAHON: On page 36, line 15, strike out "\$100,000" and insert "\$100,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Title VI—General provisions.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COUDERT: Page 51, add a new section, beginning on line 9, as follows:

"SEC. 601. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used for the costs of sending or maintaining abroad ground troops in excess of six divisions in implementation of article 3 of the North Atlantic Treaty."

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, it is a truism never better demonstrated than by the experience we have had with this problem of sending troops to implement the North Atlantic Pact Treaty. The truism is that nothing is ever settled until it is settled right.

You will all remember the great debate last winter in which there was fought out in the Senate, in the press, and on the radio, and on every street corner, the constitutional question of who should have the right to declare war, to create the conditions out of which war or peace might arise, and in detail as to whether or not the President, under our constitutional system, had absolute and unlimited power to commit unlimited bodies of troops anywhere in the world at his own sweet will.

The net result, as you will recall, was that long and extensive debate on Senate Resolution 99, in which the Senate, by an overwhelming majority of 69 to 21, declared unequivocally and without limitation or reservation the principle that before troops were sent abroad in any substantial numbers congressional approval should be obtained, and in that same resolution the Senate approved, in effect, the six-division request of the administration.

Now, if this matter had been settled right, I would not be on the floor here today taking your time with this amendment. It was not settled right, Mr. Chairman, because the President and the Democratic leadership were unwilling to permit that resolution, which passed the Senate, to come before the membership of this House, to be passed by the House, and so to become law. The net effect of it was that the Senate operated with the administration on the assumption that they could deal on a basis of good faith on both sides. The history of this situation indicates very clearly how completely misplaced that assumption was and how completely unfounded was the belief that Congress could rely upon this administration, the State Department, or Defense Department to act in good faith in dealing with the Congress.

When the North Atlantic Pact was before the Senate for ratification, in answer to a question by a Senator, the Secretary of State himself declared emphatically and unreservedly "No" to the question of whether troops would be expected or asked for to implement the preparedness phases of the North Atlantic Pact. Yet, a few days later, a few weeks later, a few months later, troops are sent. The Senate was told of it, and the great debate began as to whether troops might be sent without the authorization and approval of Congress. In the course of the hearings, those very hearings as to how many troops would be sent, the other top-level member of the Truman administration appeared as a witness before the Senate and testified that six divisions were what they wanted; that six divisions were all that were needed to constitute America's contribution to the NATO army. The question was asked how many men were involved in six divisions, and, again, without reservation, unequivocally, the answer was given, 200,000 men.

On the assumption that 200,000 men were involved in 6 divisions, the Senate passed that resolution which was introduced by the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs jointly with the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, by an overwhelming majority, and the people by an overwhelming majority, in my judgment, approved the sending of 6 divisions to participate in the build-up of the North Atlantic army.

Lo! and behold, here the other day, again, the Secretary of Defense appeared before a Senate committee, several months after the great debate, after the proposal had become accepted and we were sending 6 divisions of 200,000 men. "How many men are to be abroad by the end of the year?" somebody asked the great Secretary of Defense. "Oh," he said, "400,000." In other words, the division in the mind of the Pentagon in dealing with the Congress and the public is an accordion division to be made small when seeking congressional approval and to be stretched to the supreme limit when the troop ship is on the tide.

So that twice, twice by the very top level members of the administration, Congress has been misled into acceptance of commitments by testimony which proved wholly inaccurate. I say, Mr. Chairman, the time has come, in the exercise of its own sacred trust to the people of America, its trust to safeguard the liberties of a free people, for it to take a position that requires it no longer to rely upon the feeble reed of the good faith of an administration whose good faith has proven to be nonexistent.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEARNEY. The gentleman speaks about 6 divisions. Have we any assurance from the Administration or the Department of Defense that those 6 divisions will not be expanded to double in size?

Mr. COUDERT. Only this, I might say to the gentleman from New York, that the division of last February has already been doubled in size, and I think even the Department of Defense would be ashamed to double it again if we adopt this amendment today to reaffirm by law the 6 divisions limitation.

What this amendment will do is all that can be done within the limitations of the rules applying to appropriation bills. It will limit the use of the funds in this bill to maintaining under Article III abroad more than the 6 divisions which the department has asked for. They have not asked for any more. When they come to ask for any more, they are going to come here and ask for them and get authorization from the Congress.

Let me make clear the main premise. This amendment is limited to the application of article 3 of the North Atlantic Treaty. Article 3 deals only with the build-up provisions and the creation of an army in the period short of war. It does not limit whatever the powers of

the President under the North Atlantic Pact or his constitutional powers in the event of attack, because in article 5 of the North Atlantic Pact it is provided that an attack against one of the partners is an attack against each of the partners. So that if there were an attack, the President then would be free to do whatever is necessary with whatever available military power we have to resist that attack. This resolution, therefore, in no wise limits that.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I compliment the gentleman on offering his amendment. Would the gentleman consider a further amendment to the amendment, to add the words "in no event to exceed the number of 200,000 troops", so as to avoid the situation as referred to by the gentleman from New York?

Mr. COUDERT. I, personally, might not object to that, but I think there are possibly practical objections to it. I have heard other members say that they would accept this, but they would object to the 200,000 figure because that is a little too precise. Personally, I do not know how many troops ought to go. I am not offering this in opposition to NATO or for the purpose of limiting the operations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. I think we are committed to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Under the gentleman's amendment, what would be the situation if an emergency developed and we would have some 30 or 60 days prior notice that there was a requirement of more than six divisions in position for combat? Just what nullifying effect would the language of the gentleman's amendment have?

Mr. COUDERT. May I answer the gentleman's question with a question? How long does it take to call the Congress into session, if it happens to be out of session and for how many months in the year over the last 3 years, has Congress not been in session? In other words the answer is: So long as we are in the build-up period, Congressional authorization can be obtained in the twinkling of an eye where there is a showing of real necessity.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I venture to say to the gentleman that I cannot agree with his assumption because we have too much evidence in the past that the Congress has not functioned that rapidly.

Mr. COUDERT. I am afraid I do not agree with the gentleman.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is a consistent position the gentleman takes.

Mr. COUDERT. The question is whether the Congress is going to have

any authority in the matter of military affairs. We are faced here today with a question as to whether or not the Congress is going to retain any measure of authority in the Government of the United States. Today, we are in a situation where the hand that controls the Pentagon, rules the land. The Pentagon has two-thirds of our budget. The Pentagon has the power of life and death over all the manpower subject to the draft. It has a standing army of three-and a half million men. Yet, we here in the Congress, as the thing stands today, have absolutely nothing to say and no authority over what is done with those troops. Yesterday in the New York Times, there was a letter by a very distinguished publicist, known all over the world, who says when the Korean War is over we should send four Army corps to Germany—to Europe—just as quickly as possible, instead of the single corps now there. I say to you, the time has come when the Congress must take a hand in this.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield.

Mr. KEARNEY. As I understand the gentleman's amendment, it provides not more than six divisions?

Mr. COUDERT. That is right.

Mr. KEARNEY. Will the gentleman inform the committee as to his thoughts on any supporting corps of artillery or auxiliary troops which the Department of Defense may need in addition to the six divisions?

Mr. COUDERT. The amendment speaks of ground troops—six divisions of ground troops. The Department has demonstrated very plainly that it does not recognize any very serious limitations as to what constitutes supporting troops. As somebody rather facetiously remarked the other day, he wondered if they would include the munition workers who make the munitions for the soldiers when they add up to make up a total.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Is not the gentleman substituting his view for that of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, as to how best the 3,500,000 men can be deployed? The gentleman says it will be six divisions. He is doing that, and he wants Congress to do it instead of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. So the 3,500,000 are being organized to oppose a particular potential enemy.

Mr. COUDERT. No, I am not substituting my judgment. I simply say that I am not prepared, so far I have anything to do with it, to trust my life and the lives of the people of my country solely to the generals.

Let me recall an observation of Clemenceau, one of the greatest statesmen in the world, when he said:

War is too serious a business to leave to the military.

If war is too serious a business to leave to the military, then certainly the conduct of war and peace and the Government of a great country at home and in its relations with the world is too seri-

ous a business to leave to the Joint Chiefs of Staff alone.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. The gentleman is not substituting his judgment for that of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. He is simply writing into the law what the judgment of the Joint Chiefs of Staff is at this time, but in view of the fact that we had an entirely different understanding as to what the Joint Chiefs meant 2 years ago, the Congress at least could put in limitations that the Joint Chiefs of Staff say is sufficient at the present time. He is not substituting his judgment for theirs.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. As the gentleman will recall, I supported as best I could a very similar amendment in connection with the extension of the Selective Service. It might be of interest to recall that that amendment came within five votes of carrying. At that time it was urged that the resolution that had come from the other body was the proper way to get at it. Nothing has happened on that resolution. So I again say, here is the way to do it. We heard the observation of the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] with respect to the right of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Commander-in-Chief to deploy troops. I am wondering if those who talk about troop deployment would carry that so far as to completely eliminate the Constitutional right, duty, and obligation of the Congress to declare war. It seems to me that they would pursue it so far that they would render Congress completely impotent in the making of that most tremendous and vital decision for the people of this country.

Mr. COUDERT. I thank the gentleman for that contribution. The light of parliaments has been dying all over the world. It has been dying for the failure to do the very thing that this Congress is being asked to do now, and repeatedly asked to do; that is, assert its power and maintain its power as the representatives of the people and the guardians of the liberty of the people.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. SUTTON. Does not the gentleman realize that his amendment does not mean anything, in that under the reorganization plan it does not define what a division is? It may be 100,000 or 5,000 or 1,000. You limit it to six divisions, and it does not mean anything.

Mr. COUDERT. It depends on the extent to which the high officials of this Government will go in misleading the people of this United States. The Congress will be in session. If six divisions is not enough and the military say they would like to have eight divisions, as far as I am concerned they could have more if they could make a good case.

Let me make this plain: I am in favor of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. I am in favor of supporting Eisenhower's army, and nothing I do, to the best of my judgment, is going to impair the chance of making a success of that. But I honestly and firmly believe that the fact that Congress has something to say, that Congress must be consulted will be constructive rather than weaken the hands of General Eisenhower in his handling of American interests abroad.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Is it not true that we are assured continually that General Eisenhower and his staff are meeting with reasonable success in building up or at least laying the foundation for the building up or increase in the forces of the countries of Europe and that every unit they provide will take the place of an American unit?

Mr. COUDERT. I understand so.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield.

Mr. PRICE. As to the gentleman's amendment, first of all I do not believe the Congress is delegating any of its authority to anyone in providing that the Joint Chiefs of Staff may do certain things, make certain decisions. I have the feeling that if you leave these matters to Congress and open to debate in the Congress that you are simply giving the Kremlin blueprints of your plans far in advance.

Mr. COUDERT. To which I would like to say that the gentleman is an optimist indeed if he thinks that large bodies of troops can move across broad oceans to countries where three out of every four persons are either Communists or Communist sympathizers and not have the Kremlin learn about the facts.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield.

Mr. DEVEREUX. I wish to concur in the thoughts the gentleman has presented that Congress should retain the power to make commitments of troops. In this particular instance, however, the gentleman's amendment provides for six divisions without any supporting troops whatsoever. From a practical point of view, if it is limited solely to six divisions, there will not be a well-rounded organization over there.

Mr. COUDERT. May I answer that by saying that the Senate resolution back in February said "six ground divisions." That then was interpreted by General Marshall and his military aides to be 200,000 men, and he included the troops needed for air defense and others that would have to go with it. Recently, too, General Collins indicated that six

divisions in military parlance did include all the necessary auxiliary troops, air, and everything else; so six divisions in the military mind means a particular group. They understand it. The danger is not that they will construe it too narrowly.

Mr. DEVEREUX. I agree with the gentleman. Suppose you put a limitation in the amendment "six divisions or not over 200,000 troops," which would agree apparently with what they had in mind in the other body; would not that be a fairer presentation of the case?

Mr. COUDERT. One could make a case for it, but I think in view of the fact that after long debate this language received the support of the entire body of the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee and Armed Services Committee, supported by almost everybody else, that it goes a long way in accomplishing what we want to accomplish. As far as I am concerned, I would not be here on the floor today with this amendment if the leadership here had permitted the Senate resolution to come out on this floor and given us a chance to vote for it and adopt it.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and the remarks he made earlier today.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, the argument which has been advanced is a very persuasive one, but it proposes the adoption of an amendment which would be extremely limiting in its effect and which would be dangerous in operation. Despite the best of intentions, Congress almost never moves rapidly. There are occasions, of course, when we are able to conduct business with great speed, but there are many more occasions when we do not.

There is another thing to take under consideration. If an explosion occurs, almost inevitably it is going to occur all over the world within a matter of hours. When the Reds move in Europe we will feel it at home. How do we know that simultaneously with the launching of a Red attack on Western Europe there will not be an atomic attack on Washington, and in the shambles that would follow, how quickly could the Congress move, if, indeed, there were anything left of Congress to act?

Now, the pending amendment wants us to usurp powers not heretofore exercised by the Congress. In the history of the Nation we have plenty of precedents to show that we should not now usurp this kind of power.

Then the proposal goes one step further. It is limited to ground troops only. Why ground troops only? If it is good for one branch of the service, why is it not good for all?

Mr. Chairman, we do not conduct military operations by law. You do not pass a bill each time forces are to be moved in a strategic area, or into and out of combat. You conduct military operations from strategic and tactical considerations.

What is the problem? Our people in Europe are facing a foe in their immedi-

ate vicinity of 1,000,000 men. By this amendment we could very well jeopardize the life of every American in Europe. We could jeopardize the chances that we have of preventing Europe from being overrun and of turning its population and industrial capacity, over to the Reds. Reinforcements may have to go very quickly to Europe. It is not the plan at this time to send them. That has clearly been brought out. But things may occur which may make it necessary to send them and to send them quickly.

Every military leader says this limiting and dangerous amendment could be extremely bad and they see no good that could come of it. It would tie the hands of the military. It would set up the Congress as the director of tactical and strategic operations, and we are not equipped, prepared, or trained to act in that capacity. We have to depend upon our military leaders for military decisions. If we do not have confidence enough in the ones we have to depend on them, we had better get rid of them and get some others. The NATO forces are being built up to be the principal defenders of Europe, but this will take time. At the moment we must not tie the hands of the people we are depending on to hold the line until the NATO forces are stronger.

We have the assurance of the Joint Chiefs of Staff that they will discuss these matters with the proper committees of Congress at any time it appears there is a need for more troops for Europe. They have shown no indication of wanting to proceed without going into these matters with the proper committees of Congress and I do not see how we can ask for more.

I trust the amendment will be defeated.

(Mr. GAVIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Certainly with the great difficulties General Eisenhower is experiencing with the development of the MDAP program, I do not believe this is the appropriate time to discuss the troops for Europe question.

The bill before us is an appropriation bill and we should pass it today to indicate to the world that this war effort is an all-out one and we are determined to see it through.

So far as the defense of Western Europe is concerned, certainly it is essential that we protect the vital areas containing those raw materials, industrial plants, and technically skilled workers which constitute the major war potential of that continent. We must also be in a position to protect, for our forces and those of our allies, strategically located air bases from which we can deliver blows against the enemy and to hold such bases against attack by air or ground, or both. Finally, we must, if we are to succeed, fire the hopes and raise the morale of the people of Western Europe and build their determination to protect their homes and way of life.

As I have stated before, the Red Army and its satellite forces now poised along

the unnatural boundary from Stettin to Trieste are capable of marching into Western Europe at any time. The fear of swift retaliation delivered by our Air Force no doubt acts as a deterrent; and I fervently hope that it will remain so until we can improve our situation.

However, it is my opinion that no such retaliation could stop a march of the Russian ground armies, and the interruption to their lines of supply and communication would not become effective for some months.

Ever since 1945 the Russians have been building tanks, artillery, and other weapons, and it may safely be assumed that if they commence hostilities in this region they will have stockpiles of supplies and ammunition to last for a considerable period.

We must be prepared, with the aid of our allies, in event they move, to first stop the Russian Army, and second, to roll it back as speedily as possible. We must have ground forces in Europe able to stop their armies. Later, in order to dislodge them and drive them back to their own country.

I have urged before—and shall again—that our State Department take more vigorous and affirmative action toward securing the invaluable assistance of troops from Western Germany and Spain. It is gratifying to know that something along this line is now being done. I likewise hope that our allies in Britain and France will develop effective armies within a comparatively short time. At the present, though, I am convinced that the maintenance of Western Europe as a part of the free world requires the presence of American ground forces.

We have pumped twenty-five or more billion dollars into Europe. To fail to protect, with the help of our allies, the Ruhr and Saar Valleys with their great industrial potential, would be a fatal mistake. The recovery of Europe is now almost complete. Morale is growing stronger daily.

General Eisenhower is turning in a magnificent performance under difficult circumstances and we cannot let him down. The American people have confidence in him to do this job, which is a most difficult one. Now that we have launched this defense program, let us not make his task more difficult by again raising this question, which puts fear in the hearts of the people of Europe, as to whether or not we intend to carry through.

Let us wait until General Eisenhower submits to us a further report. I think he will insist that the other countries do their share and that we do no more than our share as far as ground forces are concerned. Let us wait to hear what he expects us to do before we again raise this question.

There was a time when it could be said by Americans that the wars and the welfare of those distant lands were of no immediate concern to us; but that is no longer true. The growth of scientific knowledge, increasing complexity of scientific inventions and industrial productivity have so reduced the size of the world and increased the interdependence of all nations upon each other that

whether it pleases or pains us, we must be constantly and increasingly concerned with the trend of events in lands beyond the sea.

Today the world is again becoming an armed camp. Soviet aggression and the dictatorial lust of the warlords of the Kremlin have caused the grim specter of war to haunt us and it is brought home daily by the loss of our boys in Korea.

The dearly-bought liberties of the people of this Nation are in peril, and if we fail to exercise that vigilance which has always been the price of liberty, we shall have betrayed the sweat, the tears, the blood, and the sacrifices of our forefathers.

We must labor and we must give without stint in this all-out effort to build a great national defense program to prepare this country to meet any and all emergencies and demands that may be made upon us.

I have deep faith that America will not fail mankind in this critical hour. Let us work and strive together in this great all-out effort to return the world to peace and stability.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, we have got to get across to Europe the idea that they must prepare to defend themselves on the ground soon. Our Foreign Affairs Committee has spent 7 weeks in hearings on the mutual security program on the question of military and economic aid to other countries, including this NATO structure. I am supporting this amendment, because I think it will help, not hurt, in getting Europe to take the necessary steps for her own defense. I am not substituting my judgment for the Joint Chiefs of Staff or our military leaders, but because the six divisions represent their judgment as to what is now needed.

Let me quote a colloquy that I had with General Collins on July 19, during the hearings. This will be found in the printed hearings, so that it is public, not secret:

Mr. VORYS. I want to remind you that exactly the same representations were made as to possible ground forces in Europe, on and off the record, to this committee in 1949, that were made before the Senate committee.

Now on February 19, 1951, in the Senate hearings on assignment of ground forces in the European area, Senator GREEN said to you, as follows:

"Senator GREEN. Up to the present time under the conditions as you see them now and believe you can reasonably forecast them, six divisions will do the trick?

"General COLLINS. Under the present world conditions, yes, sir.

"Senator GREEN. Thank you."

I want to ask you whether your answer would still be the same to that question.

General COLLINS. Yes. Essentially the same.

Now that is under present conditions and conditions that can reasonably be forecast. Do not forget what the NATO idea was, and I quote General Bradley before our committee in 1949:

In our approach to this arms-aid program, the Joint Chiefs of Staff have followed the principle that the man in the best position, and with the capability, should do the job for which he is best suited.

Further, our recommendations for this program have been predicated upon this

basic principle, and the following assumed factors:

First, the United States will be charged with the strategic bombing.

We have repeatedly recognized in this country that the first priority of the joint defense is our ability to deliver the atomic bomb.

Second, the United States Navy and the western union naval powers will conduct essential naval operations, including keeping the sea lanes clear. The western union and other nations will maintain their own harbor and coastal defense.

Third, we recognize that the hard core of the ground power in being will come from Europe, aided by other nations as they can mobilize.

Fourth, England, France, and the closer countries will have the bulk of the short-range-attack bombardment, and air defense. We, of course, will maintain the tactical Air Force for our own ground and naval forces, and United States defense.

Fifth, other nations, depending upon their proximity or remoteness from the possible scene of conflict, will emphasize appropriate specific missions.

Let us get clear what we are doing for NATO and for Europe. We are furnishing all the strategic bombing, and all of the money for strategic air in this vast bill under consideration is committed to that part of the defense of Europe. We have no limitations on our naval support. We are going to put in an amount equal to about 10 percent of the fifty-six billions you have got here in this bill today for military equipment of the forces of Europe; but when it comes to ground forces, we are only to furnish a token force of six divisions. We furnish this force that will be in being on the ground there under article 3 of the treaty, but if this plan for the defense of Europe is to work at all, Europe has got to build up rapidly its own ground forces very soon. Eisenhower and his generals have said we have got to make it clear to them that our part in the ground phase of it is to end soon. The way to make it end soon is to make it clear that what the Joint Chiefs have said is sufficient for now and the foreseeable future, is going to be all there is on the ground from us. Otherwise, Europe will dawdle and delay, thinking we will increase our ground forces some more.

We turned over our billions committed in strategic air power to the defense of Europe. We have turned over the strongest Navy in the world to the defense of Europe without any limitation on our Commander in Chief. We have turned over billions of dollars' worth of arms and military equipment to equip and maintain their divisions, but when it comes to fighting on the ground they are supposed to furnish the hard core, as General Bradley said, and we are supposed merely to furnish the forces of six divisions, including support forces that have been described here today. So that for the sake of defending Europe we ought to make it clear that we are not going on and on in this emergency with more and more ground forces.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have the greatest respect and admiration for the gentleman

from New York who has offered this amendment. I would not take the floor at this time did I not feel it to be matter of patriotic duty that the Members of the House at this time should have a clear understanding of what they are voting on.

There are two articles in this NATO organization, article III and article V, that relate to this situation. Article III relates to what might be done before hostilities might break out. Article V relates to what might be done in the event hostilities actually do break out. Under article V there is no limitation as to what might be done either under the Senate resolution, which was advisory only, or under the amendment which has here been offered. But we all know that the situation we are confronted with in Europe will not be measured so much by what is done after hostilities break as by what is done in the line of preparation and deliberate preparedness for what might come.

For my own part, I have no more confidence than the gentleman who has offered this amendment in the present administration or in what it might do but, frankly, I do not want to be a party to saying that there must be a definite limit fixed upon the number of troops or the number of divisions that may be sent to Europe to protect the situation we are in in the world today. We are in that situation, in my opinion, entirely because of the incompetence of our administration and the incompetence of the State Department. I think there can be little gainsaying of that.

How are we, without knowing just what the situation is we are going to confront, going to say 1 division, 2 divisions, 3 divisions, 4 divisions, 6 divisions, or 10 divisions are what should be sent?

Frankly, I am as disturbed as anyone at the failure at this time and so far on the part of our allies to devote as much as I believe they should devote to the building up of their defenses and to the development of the armed forces for which they have unquestionably available manpower to meet the situation.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman says he has no confidence in this administration. Yet is he willing to turn over authority to this administration?

Mr. TABER. I think if the gentleman will wait until I finish he will find the answer to that. If I have not given it, then I will yield.

Mr. Chairman, having this situation in mind, I requested the chairman of our subcommittee to have General Collins before our subcommittee this morning. General Collins appeared. If I may be permitted to do so, I will read briefly from what was said:

Mr. MAHON. What does the Department of Defense anticipate doing in the fiscal year

1952 in addition to the program which you have outlined involving about 284,000 Army troops in round numbers and about 60,000 Air Force troops?

General COLLINS. Nothing. This is the total program for 1952.

Mr. MAHON. In the event you wanted to revise the program in the light of unforeseen developments, what would you do?

General COLLINS. I do not doubt a bit but that we would come up to the Congress and discuss it. Certainly we have made it a policy, so far as the Army is concerned, to always consult with the chairman of the two committees, and the chairman of this committee.

Mr. MAHON. If there should be any change in the fiscal year 1952 in your plans, insofar as troops for Europe are concerned, you would make sure that this committee is notified and that the whole committee, not just the chairman, is given information with regard to the plan in advance of the definite and final decisions?

General COLLINS. I will, definitely.

Mr. TABER. Can we say that on the floor of the house?

General COLLINS. Yes.

Mr. TABER. That before you make a move you will call the attention of the committee to what you propose to do?

General COLLINS. Yes.

Mr. TABER. And will you give the committee a chance to talk with you?

General COLLINS. Yes.

Mr. MAHON. Can we also give on the floor of the House the figures that you have given in your statement?

General COLLINS. I believe you can, Mr. MAHON.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Does the gentleman understand those are also the views of General Marshall who has told the country in the last 2 weeks that it will be 400,000 plus troops?

Mr. TABER. I did not ask General Marshall. General Collins is in command of the Army. It is customary to deal with such things with the Chief of Staff of the Army insofar as they relate to the army. General Marshall's statement undoubtedly included the figures relating to the Air Force. Frankly, we have never in our experience with the Army, Navy or the Air Force, found that they have failed to meet a promise which they have made to the committee along this line.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Is it not a fact that General Collins, as Chief of Staff, this morning also stated that from the military point of view it would be a very serious mistake to place a definite limitation on the number of troops?

Mr. TABER. That is correct. In addition to that, we all realize, and must realize, that when these officers of the Army agree to take up a thing like that with the Committee on Appropriations, it could be taken up without having the thing out in the open, practically coming to the point of discussion whether or not we were going into trouble with Russia and letting Russia know all about what we were going to do. For my own part, I do not want them doing that.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to see if we can get some limitation on time for debate.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like to speak on this subject, and I would like more than 5 minutes, if possible.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it seems clear from the way the debate has proceeded so far that if we pass this amendment we are not going to limit the number of troops going to Europe. That is clear from the testimony that is referred to in support of the amendment. It can be 200,000 or 400,000 or antiaircraft and many other troop units can be added. I served in the Army, and a great many others have. They know that when you add the AA and the corps and Army artillery and the various troops of other auxiliary and supply services you have an estimate of six divisions, but you cannot put a firm roof on the number of troops. Everybody understands that. Hence, what is the reason for proposing this amendment? The reason is to give expression, I believe, of the intent of Congress, and to assert what the proponent of the amendment claims to be the power of Congress, that Congress should control the place to which the Commander in Chief and the Joint Chiefs of Staff may deploy troops.

I will not repeat the splendid argument made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] against this amendment, but I would like to take up where he left off. Let us see from the point of view of assessing the capability of those opposed to us what this means to the Communists. That is whom this mobilization is directed to ward defending against. Let us see what it means to them if we pass this amendment. It means two things, as I see it, of great importance, and it represents a real gain for them.

First, those of us who have been deeply concerned about how much we have already told them about what is our basic strategy will find that we have by this amendment only agreed for the future to take them further into our confidence.

Suppose General Collins says tomorrow: "I do not need only six divisions for Europe. I now need eight divisions." Then we have got to come back to the floor and amend this bill or take some other legislative action, which expresses the very reason why we are proposing to change our troop employment for any observer in the gallery to note.

Secondly, what are the Communists going to do with this amendment, if we pass it? They will blast their propaganda everywhere in the world, saying: "You see, we told you. These American representatives, these American generals can go around the world and ask you to be all out for defense, but they are not going to be all for defense, because their Congress is still holding back—going part way—showing again those views which they had in the nineteen twenties."

This will be used in their propaganda to support the phoney argument the Soviets have been making about how we

intend to deal with our allied peoples in respect of mutuality of sacrifice. I think it is a mistake then to adopt this amendment at this particular time, especially when it does, as it admitted, no substantial good to a roof on troops.

A lot has been said here about the dignity and power of the Congress. But there is also the question whether the Congress is not stepping out of its established powers and if the amendment proposed would not, if carried, amount to taking over the powers of the Executive as Commander in Chief? Are we not by this amendment seeking to assume to ourselves the prerogatives and functions of military command? Clearly contrary to the constitutional arrangement for three effective branches of Government.

Mr. COUDERT. Does the gentleman mean to assert that while we in this House are passing a nearly \$60,000,000,000 military bill with another six, or eight, or thirteen billions to come tomorrow, that anybody could even fool the Russian people to believe that we are not serious about this business?

Mr. JAVITS. I mean to assert exactly that if we are going to write such provisions as this amendment provides for, about the deployment of troops, where they can be sent and used; I mean to assert exactly that if we are going to try to be the generals in this House, 435 of us, instead of having some confidence ourselves in the military command that the Congress itself confirms.

Mr. COUDERT. Does the gentleman honestly believe that you can send American divisions to Germany and not have the Kremlin know of that not more than 2 seconds afterward?

Mr. JAVITS. I said no such thing; I said only that we will soon be letting them know much more by adopting this amendment, and I am not in favor of letting them know any more than we must about our fundamental strategy which should be among the most highly classified secrets of the United States.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly do not like to find myself in disagreement with anyone here and certainly not in disagreement with my very dear friend, JOHN TABER. Certainly I think it is seldom that I disagree with him, but on this occasion I must.

Before I get into the merits of this matter I want to pay some attention to the remarks just made by my very dear friend and able Representative the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS]. He gets up here and worries about what the Kremlin is going to do, what they are going to think. May I say to my friend that it is about time we here put that out of our minds. This is a great Nation in which we live. We should not worry about what the Kremlin thinks about what we do. I sincerely hope we will no longer hear it said, as a conclusive answer or argument against anything that may be proposed, that it is going to be a great victory for the Kremlin. As a matter of fact, may I say to my friend that there is one great thing that distinguishes this country of ours from Russia, and that is

that here in this Hall and in this great seat of government in the United States of America are gathered the representatives of the people who yet exercise under our great Constitution the powers there allocated to the legislative branch of the Government. There is no such thing in Russia. Why should it be argued that possibly we here should so abdicate our responsibilities under that Constitution as to create in this country that sort of dictatorial one-man government which now exists in Russia? For my part I want no part of it. I am not going to duck my responsibility. I shall yield to the military the responsibilities that are theirs, but I have some responsibilities, to, and, certainly, I am going to exercise them.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I think the gentleman would be the last man in the world to want to suppress a view as to something we contemplate doing which I sincerely feel might help the Communists opposed to us. Would we not be unwise, indeed, if we debated in a vacuum, taking no account of the power of the Communist forces or what they could do with the openings we give them. The fundamental thing about military science, as the gentleman knows as well as I, is, first, our own capability; and second, the "enemy" capability. Intelligence about what the other side will do is vital and must always be taken into account. We certainly want to consider that. That is all I have ever asked.

I have fought for bills to arm us even more against the Communist menace as the gentleman knows, on the affirmative side. Even now my position on this very amendment is exactly along this line. I think it is vital to point out, however, whether what we are doing will aid those against us in any material way, and what I said can only be construed in that sense.

Mr. HALLECK. I did not challenge the gentleman's right to say what he did and I did not question his integrity or his convictions. It may well be that his argument here is sound as against mine. I have only asserted my view in respect to it.

Now, let us reflect a moment on what has transpired. First of all, you will recall that when the Atlantic Treaty was up in the Senate, both the State Department and the Military Department assured the Members of Congress that troops to Europe would not be committed except with congressional approval. Then troops were committed to Europe without congressional approval and the people said, "What goes on here?"

That started what has come to be known as the great debate. It was somewhat overwhelmed by certain other things that happened in the Asiatic theater having to do with the dismissal of General MacArthur. What we are doing here is carrying on a part of that so-called great debate in another chapter.

Let us get this thing clear. Reference has been made to a troop limitation that

is here contained. Does not everyone realize that reference to six divisions, and it is, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] said, apparently something of an accordion operation, is a term that is understood, and when we limit it to divisions I suppose it carries with it necessarily, or certainly it would be so interpreted, the supporting troops that are necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, it seems very clear to me that all we say in the adoption of this amendment is that the six divisions now committed shall go on under the Atlantic Pact, but before additional divisions are committed the Congress of the United States shall be consulted, the Congress of the United States being the representatives of the people. Can anyone deny that? To me it is no argument to say that General Collins appeared before the Appropriations Committee or a subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee today and said that during 1952 we have in mind nothing beyond the six divisions that are already committed.

If that is true, and that testimony is to be made public may I say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] maybe it is giving aid and comfort to the Kremlin. I do not know, but if that is the proposed plan of our military leaders at the time, then what damage is done to say that for the time covered by this bill further commitments shall be brought to the Congress of the United States? For the life of me, I cannot see why there should be any concern about it.

As has been pointed out, almost this identical resolution, but in a directive form, was adopted in the other body by an overwhelming vote.

A similar amendment to this was offered to the Selective Service Act. It lost by five votes in the Committee of the Whole with a large membership present. One of the principal arguments at that time was that in due course the resolution that came out of the other body would come before the House of Representatives, and we here could express our opinion as the opinion was expressed in the other body. So, the Towe amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey was defeated by five votes. But, in the meantime that resolution has never been reported by the Committee and we have had no opportunity to pass on it.

Now we come along to appropriate the money to provide for the national defense, clearly the prerogative of the Congress of the United States, the bill originating in the House of Representatives. So, what do we do by this amendment? We simply say six divisions. We do not quarrel about that, but in this great decision that might be subsequently made we think the Congress of the United States should be further consulted. And let no one think for a min-

ute that the Congress of the United States will not meet any responsibility that it is required to meet in the best interests of our country and its security. In all of my time here I have never seen the Congress fail to respond when such a crisis as that came along, and I venture to assert that the Congress always will be ready to respond. Now then, if the military should find reason to come to the Committee on Appropriations or to a subcommittee thereof and say "We need more troops than the six divisions," then should not you and I, as just Members of the House of Representatives have a part in that voice? We, too, should have those representations made to us to the end that we, too, might participate in the making of that decision. As I said, I spoke on this matter when it was before us earlier in this session. I cannot think of anything better now than to just quote a few of the paragraphs from what I said then:

In all the arguments I have read and heard incident to the current debate in no case has anyone challenged the constitutional right of the Congress to declare war. No one has suggested that there is any ambiguity whatsoever in article I, section 8, clause 11 of the Constitution which sets out in unequivocal terms that the Congress shall have power to declare war.

Does anyone here contend that the framers of the Constitution intended that such power should be a purely academic aftermath of Executive action? Was the historic role of the Congress meant to consist of an accessory after the fact?

I submit that it was precisely because the matter of troop deployment is so closely aligned to the power of declaring war that the Congress was given iron-clad assurances by the administration, during the Senate discussion of the proposed Atlantic Pact arrangement, that acceptance of this treaty would in no way involve this country in a commitment of troops.

Then I said this also, and it fits today as it did then:

We must face up to the fact that we are living in a time when a declaration of war has become an old-fashioned device in the minds of many. Wars today culminate in shooting after a step-by-step process in which the representatives of the people are being increasingly euhed into impotence.

The founders of this Nation realized full well the grave implications of a declaration of war; that the power to make such a declaration—a move which plunges any nation into the darkness of death and destruction—should never be vested in a single man.

Is it conceivable, then, that in placing this great responsibility on the shoulders of the Congress, the framers of our Constitution meant that the Congress should exercise no authority in that great twilight zone between peace and war? Was the Congress meant to sit idly by, waiting for the darkness of conflict to fall?

The issue before us is simple: Shall the Congress abdicate its historic and constitutional right and obligation to make major decisions affecting the lives and resources of the people it has been elected to represent? Shall momentous decisions be usurped by the executive branch of the Government, leaving to the Congress purely academic powers of providing the wherewithal in men and money to carry out the designs and adventures of the administration, whatever they may be?

In other words, may I say to my friends in the House, I cannot see where the adoption of this amendment represents

any retreat at all from our firm determination to protect this great country of ours and to meet our responsibilities and obligations in a world beset with fear of destruction and war.

On the contrary, it seems to mean only that we here in Congress insist that we share in the making of these great decisions, that we here shall have our voice and our say in what those decisions shall be.

Finally, let me say this: Wholly apart from the technical aspects of the matter, this great country of ours, great as it is, cannot meet its obligations in the world, we cannot protect ourselves at home, unless the people of the country have confidence in what is being done here and are sure that the decisions that are made are in the national interest. I do not think it is too much to say that certain people in great numbers in this country have lost a lot of their confidence in certain branches of the Government. I hope and trust they have not lost their confidence in the legislative branch of the Government, but I assert this, that any decision vitally affecting the lives of the people, joined in by the Congress of the United States, will better enlist the support of the people generally. It is that support that we must have if we are to be successful in meeting these great problems that confront us.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if it would be possible to get a limitation on the time for debate on this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 35 minutes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 40 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 35 minutes, with 5 minutes reserved to the committee.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ARMSTRONG].

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support this amendment. I do so for two reasons. In the first place, as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] so eloquently said, it will put our European allies more definitely on notice that they themselves must furnish more of the resources of war, particularly the manpower, for the defense of Europe and the free world. It seems to me this needs to be emphasized at this time. We should now decide what is to be the major contribution of the United States of America to our own defense and to the defense of free peoples everywhere. It must be clear to everyone that the Soviet Kremlin, representing the enemy of the free world, ardently desires two things. First of all, its leaders desire that we bankrupt ourselves in this country by draining away our material re-

sources. Secondly, that we bankrupt ourselves in manpower. Facing this situation we must decide what our major contribution can be. I submit that it is not manpower. We have contributed the major amount of manpower to the Korean War. We have done so largely because we went into this thing unilaterally and then begged the rest of our allies to come along. It just happens that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN] and I, while in Korea last April, stood with the British troops and watched them fighting the foe. We were also with the Turks and the French, and with many others of our brave allies there. Certainly they were good soldiers and they were brave, but there just were not enough of them.

We cannot furnish the manpower to whip the Communist forces all over the world. Our great contribution can be two things. First of all, in the sinews of war to give our allies the guns, and the planes, and the tanks, and the things that can be made by retaining as much of our manpower as we can in our industries and in production of food here at home. Secondly, the specific contribution, militarily speaking, of greatest importance, is air power. The Kremlin does not fear our manpower in a land army in Korea, in Germany, or anywhere else. The one thing the Kremlin fears most of all is the striking force of our air power. If we had used that air power in Korea we could have won that war by now. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN] and I talked to generals and colonels and others clear on down to the GI's.

All the American officers and men we talked to declared we could win the war in Korea decisively, by full use of our air power in bombing the enemy military targets and preventing any future build-ups in enemy forces. We could have won that war, but we did not, because our policy makers were tied to the old idea of the infantry being the "Maginot line" of offense and defense.

If we build up our air power in Europe to sufficient strength, it will not be necessary to drain off our manpower for land armies. Manpower is abundant in Europe, while it is the most expensive thing among the resources of our country.

Why did we not follow the policy of utilizing the manpower of our allies in the far-eastern conflict? One of our great allies in the United Nations, the free Chinese, offered troops for the Korean War. Our State Department planners refused to use them. Recently I visited Formosa, where I saw thousands of fine young Chinese men languishing in idleness while our American boys fought and died in an indecisive war. Every one of those Chinese could take his place in the fight for freedom. These Chinese troops could relieve many American boys, drafted from off the farms and out of the industries and schools of this country.

Mr. Chairman, the principal sources of manpower for defense of Europe should be the Europeans themselves. We could utilize to good advantage hundreds of thousands of German personnel

for the military establishment in the NATO nations. The German armies are now our allies. We should move quickly to draw them into the orbit of peaceful and democratic nations. They have a personal interest in defending themselves against Communist aggression, for their land is divided and a large share of it is now under the yoke of the Kremlin. We should call on them to furnish their share of manpower requirements to stand against Soviet expansion.

We should utilize also the manpower of Spain, of Greece, of Turkey, and all other actual or potential allies who are willing to oppose further Communist aggression.

Let us inform the whole world, here and now, that our principal contribution to the defense of the free world will be the sinews of war, emphasizing our superior and unbeatable air power, and that we expect our allies to furnish the bulk of the manpower.

(Mr. ARMSTRONG asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON].

(Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the most ardent supporter of the North Atlantic Pact principle should support this amendment. Consider the picture. Each of us who believe in the North Atlantic principle of the defense of Europe, and of our own country, knows that the manpower potential, the vast numbers that are needed, must be secured from the countries in Europe. They must provide the vast manpower requirements while we provide the sinews of war. But so long as we stand with a blank check in the hands of the President, or the Joint Chiefs of Staff, or anyone in charge who can say without regard to the Congress of the United States, "More and more American men can and will be sent over to make up this European army." Just so long will those countries in Europe be reticent to provide their own manpower. That is human nature. The pressure will be put upon our military officers in charge of the North Atlantic Pact to provide American soldiers. They will do this, that is, unless the Congress representing all the people of our country say right out frankly that there is a limit, and that we are the body that will impose that limit. Only if the European countries know American boys won't be sent over without limit will the European countries provide the manpower needed. If Congress takes this stand by adopting the Coudert amendment, then there is a chance for the North Atlantic agreement countries to really build up a big army out of the manpower they have at home. But unless and until we on this side let them know what that limit is, the pressure will be on here to take more from our country, and to provide less and less of the sacrifice which is necessary from their own country.

We have been conducting hearings and considering this bill for months; this bill to spend billions of dollars. We have held hearings. We have considered with care whether or not we are wasting money and we have decided that we are not. But now, without hearings of any kind, we are going to spend the manpower of our great country at the will and whim, if you please, of men in charge of the armed services of our country; men who, above all, are not representatives of the people as we are. You are asking Congress to give them a blank check to spend the lives of the young men and young women of our country. When it comes to dollars, you are going to have hearings and you are going to look at the almighty dollar before you send dollars abroad. You are not going to reserve the right to say whether the sons of your neighbors shall be sent overseas or not. Rather, you are going to entrust some military power, not responsible to the people at all, and give them that right. Why not use the same degree of care in preserving the young men of America you have used in spending dollars? Let the people's representatives in Congress say not only whether dollars shall be sent to Europe but, in addition, whether our sons and daughters shall be sent there to fight.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON] has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I have no desire to belabor the issue. The gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] and others have explained fully and adequately the reasons for this amendment.

I simply want to assert that the United States Congress may as well abdicate if it is going to continue to turn over to President Truman or any other President the powers and responsibilities delegated to it under the Constitution.

The power to declare war and send troops to battle on foreign soil is a power that must be retained by Congress. If it is not so retained, the very structure of this Government will eventually fall.

I support this amendment to limit American ground troops in Europe to four divisions without action by Congress to increase this strength. I only wish it were possible in this amendment to define the numerical strength of the divisions so disposed.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

(Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, this is a dangerous amendment. It seeks to legislate military strategy. I hope the House will not be misled by it. I am compelled to rise in opposition to the proposal of the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT].

The amendment addresses itself to the question of the power and authority of the President to send troops wherever

he deems it necessary in the interest of national security. I do not agree with the gentleman or any Member of the House who would seek to amend this legislation to require congressional approval to send troops to Europe or anywhere else in the interest of national security. They are at once attempting to read the minds of the masters of the Kremlin and failing to read the Constitution of the United States.

Article II, section 2, of the Constitution asserts that the President shall be "Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, and of the militia of the several States, when called into the actual service of the United States." I do not recall that ever before in our history has the authority of the President to command, thus delegated by the Constitution, been questioned. The authority of a field commander to deploy his troops can scarcely be limited, if the commander is to win victory in the field. The authority of the Commander in Chief to deploy his troops cannot be limited to a geographic area.

Whatever the mistakes American generals may have made in the past, whatever mistakes have been made in the current Korean conflict, neither Congress nor the President has presumed to set up rules governing the deployment of troops. The number of troops employed in any campaign or battle—North Africa, France, Ardennes, North Korea—has always been governed by factors quite different from congressional legislative act. In a world in which the threat to our security may come from almost any direction, it is folly to tell the Commander in Chief how many troops he may send into any theater or battle; or when he may send them. What Congress can say to a general, and what Congress does say when it approves his commission is "We have faith in your ability in a way to justify our faith." But it is the people themselves, not Congress, who say this to the President.

It is ridiculous and worse to presume to tell the Commander in Chief how he is to deploy the troops he commands, it is also ridiculous to assume that the next aggression of the Communist overlords of Europe and Asia will break out in Europe. Why not in India? Why not in Iran? For Congress to enact an amendment governing the deployment of troops to Europe, is as ridiculous as it would be for a householder to ask a single policeman to guard his front door only, leaving the back door open to a gang of thieves. No man in the United States, indeed, no man outside the Kremlin knows where communism may strike next, or in what force, or what effort will be required on our part to meet it. What we need is a riot squad, ready for action anywhere.

I cannot believe that the sponsors of so foolish and ridiculous an amendment as this we are considering are interested in doing anything more than creating an embarrassment to the President of the United States.

Surely they are ignoring the functions and the prerogatives of the Presidency and the safeguards established in the

Constitution and operative under the American system. Surely they are proving their ignorance of military strategy and presuming to direct the actions of field commanders as well as Commander in Chief. But most tragically, they are displaying a lack of faith in the American system that has served us so well for almost two hundred years. Do they fear the President more than they trust the system and the electorate that has made him Commander in Chief? Do they think that he alone can do what no American President has ever done, or presumed to do, and commit us to an untenable situation without the advice of military leaders? Do they think our future as a Nation is threatened more by maintaining unaltered the historic functions of the President than by the growth of communism? Do they think that war is played, like football, with a fixed number of men?

Mr. Chairman, there seems to me only one interpretation of this proposed amendment. It is an action taken to embarrass the President, to handicap our military leaders, and to create national security by statute rather than by strength in being.

If war comes, the United States cannot win it alone. We won neither World War I alone, nor World War II. In another war, we would have even fewer allies. And those allies will fight only if we give them hope and confidence.

Those allies will not fight if we tell them that only a limited number of divisions will be sent to them, and that even that limited number will be sent not by the Commander in Chief but by Congress, after prolonged debate. Those allies will not fight against a Russian Army of limitless manpower, certain to overwhelm them, unless they have confidence the United States will support them. But what confidence can they have in us when we display so little confidence in our own system, our own President, and, indeed, in ourselves?

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would have us prepare against unlimited aggression with limited effort; it would handicap and embarrass those charged with providing the common defense and security of the United States.

It is dangerous to our national security. It would impair the peace of the world. It should be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LANTAFF].

(Mr. LANTAFF asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Chairman, not too long ago Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower addressed the Members of this body. He told us that one of the things needed so desperately in Europe was a spirit of confidence in the NATO countries in their ability to defend their freedoms. He reported that Europe's "will to resist" had been bolstered by our support, in implementing the Atlantic Pact. The spirit of defeatism had to be overcome before Western Europe would rebuild its armies and join in confidence with us to deter Communist aggression. If we by our action today, through adoption of the

amendment offered, hinder General Eisenhower in his efforts to build up the spirit and the will to resist in Europe, then we will have destroyed everything we hope to accomplish by the adoption of this bill. Certainly, if we say to those countries, "We have given you all the support we are going to give you," then they will look around to see if they can defend themselves with the forces they have. The Russians will start their propaganda machine immediately. If we limit our military to six divisions the Communists are going to say to France and Western Germany and the Benelux countries, "You cannot defend yourselves with this force." Why bother at all to build up an army? Why bother at all to have a military budget?" The resultant spirit of defeatism would render impossible General Eisenhower's mission and would require us to send many more divisions overseas if Europe is to be denied to the Russians. General Eisenhower's whole purpose in building up a "will to resist" in Europe, and in turn building up the forces of the NATO countries will be defeated.

As I recall, General MacArthur, when he appeared before the Russell committee, was asked the question as to whether or not we should limit troops to Europe, and he responded that we should not place the military in a legislative straitjacket with respect to the disposition or utilization of our forces in accomplishing their mission.

General Bradley said that the purpose of adopting this appropriation bill was to build up a sufficient force, as soon as practicable, to act as a deterrent to further aggression. We are building up troops to act as a deterrent to further war. The most strategic area in the world is the Ruhr, because if Russia gets the Ruhr their industrial production will come dangerously close to ours.

Now, if we tell the Russians we are only going to assign six divisions to the defense of the Ruhr, we are inviting attack because we know from experience that the Communists will exploit any situation of weakness. If that is to be the effect of this amendment, and I do not see how it can be otherwise, then there is no use whatsoever for us to adopt this \$56,000,000,000 bill.

In the last war thousands of our American boys gave their lives to obtain a beachhead in Europe. Let us not abandon that beachhead by adoption of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SHEEHAN] is recognized.

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, it is my purpose here to try to give to the House some of the viewpoints of the majority of the people in my district, how I think they feel about this particular troops-to-Europe situation.

In asking someone like myself to vote on this measure it reminds me of the question a famous lawyer put to the defendant: "When did you stop beating your wife?" In other words, if you vote against this limitation of only six divisions to Europe you are in fact giving approval of sending unlimited troops to Europe; on the other hand, if you vote for a limitation you are then saying in

effect that you are in agreement with sending six divisions but this is all you are going to do, guide yourself accordingly.

But there is another thought to bear in mind, that is the thought of protecting our own shores and building up our own defenses, in having an Army, a Navy, and an Air Force to defend our own country in the event we should ever be attacked.

The question of troops to Europe in my mind and in the minds of a great number of my constituents is the question: Do we want to go to war or do we want to remain at peace? If we want to go to war I think it is the duty of Congress and the administration to tell the people coldly and bluntly that we are preparing for war with Russia; let them know; let them in on it; let them feel that they have to be consulted, because, after all, let us not kid ourselves, gentlemen, the only reason any of us are here is because we are supposed to represent the people who sent us here.

When I think of six divisions more or less in Europe I am afraid. I remember Bataan and Corregidor, I remember France quitting after very little effort; I remember Dunkirk. Are we going to take the lives of these six divisions and say to ourselves that we are going to entrust these boys to Europe and that we hope the Europeans are going to fight to protect our boys, your boys, our loved ones? I am afraid, and I am scared; and if a record vote comes up on this amendment, if it does come, I am going to vote "Present" because I do not think in the light of the past 10 years experience that I can trust six divisions or any part of it to the whims and fancies of France, and Belgium, and other countries over there who history shows may not fight to defend our boys.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] is recognized.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, when this amendment was first brought to my attention I questioned the advisability of such a move on the part of the Congress; but after listening to the very able speech by my colleague from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], I have decided to support this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we have delegated far too much authority already to just a few men in Government. I am very sure that if the Congress had long ago asserted itself in no uncertain terms and had really lived up to its responsibilities, we would not be in the terrible predicament today all over the world as well as right here in our own beloved land. So I am going to vote for the Coudert amendment because certainly the time is long past due when we must not only begin to think about our own prerogatives but also we must think about where we are going to get the money.

We are taxing our people to such a degree that until these terrific expenditures of Government are brought in line with the people's ability to pay, one of these days the American people will lose complete faith in this form of government and in everything we hold dear. When that time comes we in America will be of no use or no good to our friends across the sea let alone to ourselves, be-

cause we will be broke, broke, broke, do you understand, broke flat.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that we will all think very deeply about this matter, that we will forget our political differences and vote only for what we feel is best for America, and other peace-loving people of the world for today and for generations yet unborn.

Mr. Chairman, after much study and consultation with Members on both sides of the aisle, we concluded that the Jensen amendment could not be so drawn as to properly fit into this armed services appropriation bill, due primarily to the present uncertain strained world condition. Then on yesterday, we tentatively agreed that an amendment would be offered that would provide for a limitation of 500,000 white-collar civilian clerical personnel, instead of the approximate 641,765, provided for in this bill, which is a ratio of 1 clerical office civilian for each 5½ persons in uniform, that ratio is all out of proportion, for at the peak of the war, June 1945, the ratio was only 1 to 15.

Now it appears quite certain that a so-called watch dog committee will, within the next week be instituted by House action with sufficient staff, whose duty it will be to make complete audits and investigations as to the need for civilian office personnel and to ferret out waste of money and manpower of every nature. It is hoped the Senate will have the benefit of such investigative report in time to give proof for a reduction in civilian personnel and great dollar savings as against those provided in this bill. Consequently, I now understand no amendment to reduce civilian personnel will be offered to this bill.

I have collected much factual data relating to civilian employees, and so forth, in the armed services. I shall now read some of that data into the RECORD for all interested Members of Congress and the American people to read, for the benefit of all, I hope:

National Military Establishment, civilian and military personnel, 1939-51

Year (as of June 30)	Civilian employment			Uniformed personnel
	Total	Industrial ¹	White collar	
1939.....	195,285	63,162	132,123	341,000
1940.....	254,822	66,210	188,612	471,000
1941.....	563,686	111,098	452,488	1,819,000
1942.....	1,274,524	490,000	784,524	3,917,000
1943.....	1,982,186	1,165,999	816,187	9,201,000
1944.....	2,339,029	1,375,000	964,029	11,616,000
1945.....	2,634,058	1,467,000	1,167,058	12,295,091
1946.....	1,439,192	960,447	498,745	3,022,870
1947.....	861,645	553,403	308,242	1,572,971
1948.....	871,746	552,534	319,212	1,443,260
1949.....	884,728	541,273	343,455	1,637,000
1950.....	753,149	440,897	312,252	1,487,000
1951.....	1,235,601	739,044	496,557	3,500,000

¹ Figures on industrial employment from 1939 through 1945 are partially estimated.

² May 1950.

³ Authorized strength; actual figure classified.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HARRY F. BYRD, DEMOCRAT, VIRGINIA, CHAIRMAN, IN CONNECTION WITH MONTHLY PERSONNEL REPORT BY THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NON-ESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES (WITH SPECIAL TABLE ON PUBLICITY PAYROLL COSTS IN THE MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT)

Civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government increased in May for the 11th consecutive month. The

increase was at the rate of more than 1,000 a day, and the total employment reached 2,443,076.

The net increase during the month was 33,955—with 25,196 civilians added to the payrolls of the Military Establishment, and 8,759 additions to the payrolls of civilian agencies.

More than half of the increase was in so-called white-collar rolls, while 15,836 were added to industrial rolls for work in navy yards, arsenals, etc. Of the total Federal employment during May, 757,600 were employed for industrial type work and 1,685,476 were white-collar employees.

Of the total employment, 2,271,444 were assigned to duty stations within continental United States and 171,632 were assigned abroad.

Among the civilian agencies, major increases were reported by the Department of Agriculture, Interior Department, Economic Stabilization Agency, National Production Authority, General Services Administration and Tennessee Valley Authority. Major decreases were reported by the Post Office Department which was still employing more than a half million, and the Veterans' Administration which was still employing 184,373.

These figures were compiled today from monthly personnel statements submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Non-essential Federal Expenditures.

MILITARY PUBLICITY PAYROLL COSTS

This monthly employment compilation by the committee includes a special table showing that the Department of Defense and its components—the Army, Navy and Air Force Departments, and Office of the Secretary of Defense—this year is using 3,022 civilians and uniformed persons in advertising, publicity and public relations jobs at a payroll cost of \$10,109,109, and that in the new fiscal year, beginning July 1, it is proposed to increase the number in these jobs to 3,825, at a payroll cost of \$13,406,015.

Included among those employed in this type of work this year are 2,235 military (uniformed) personnel, and estimates show the number of military (uniformed) personnel to be employed in advertising, publicity and public relations work next fiscal year is to be increased to 2,941. Civilians would be increased from 787 this year to 884 next year.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HARRY F. BYRD, DEMOCRAT, VIRGINIA, CHAIRMAN, JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NON-ESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES, RELATIVE TO CIVILIAN PERSONNEL DURING THE MONTH OF JUNE, FISCAL YEAR 1951, AND A LETTER FROM MRS. ROSENBERG

Agencies in the executive branch of the Federal Government wound up the fiscal year in June with 2,486,755 civilian employees on the payroll and with a civilian payroll running at an annual rate of approximately \$8,500,000,000.

During the month of June the increase totaled 43,649, of whom 27,952 were civilian employees added by the Military Establishment and 15,697 by civilian agencies.

Among the civilian agencies principal increases were reported by the Department of Agriculture with 5,523, Interior Department with 3,260, Economic Stabilization Agency with 2,532, State Department with 1,374, Justice Department with 1,219, Tennessee Valley Authority with 747, General Services Administration with 678, and Federal Security Agency with 517. Major decreases were reported by the Veterans' Administration with 1,542 and the Treasury Department with 503.

HALF-MILLION INCREASE IN FISCAL YEAR

The increase during the year ending June 30 totaled 517,815, of whom 482,452 civilian employees were added to the Military Establishment and 35,363 by civilian agencies.

These figures were revealed today in the monthly compilation of personnel reports certified by the 70 reporting agencies in the executive branch of the Federal Government to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Non-essential Federal Expenditures.

LETTERS FROM MRS. ROSENBERG

In connection with the increase in civilian employment by the Military Establishment, which during the year averaged more than 1,300 a day, I am today in receipt of the following letter from Mrs. Anna M. Rosenberg, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower and Personnel:

"Hon. HARRY FLOOD BYRD,
"Chairman, Joint Committee on
Nonessential Federal Expenditures,
"United States Senate.

"DEAR SENATOR BYRD: I am enclosing a copy of a Department of Defense directive which I know will be of interest to you. This directive is in line with our increased activities for more effective utilization of military and civilian personnel, and incorporates the following major features:

"1. Establishes a ceiling for all military and civilian personnel in departmental activities in the Washington area at the strengths actually on board on July 20, 1951. Included are the departmental activities of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force, as well as those in the various boards and activities supporting the Secretary of Defense.

"2. Within the next 90 days, each military department and the agencies of the Office of the Secretary of Defense must achieve a 5-percent reduction in both military and civilian strengths within the departmental activities referred to above. These reductions will be accomplished through normal attrition or turn-over, insofar as practicable, rather than through arbitrary reductions in force.

"3. Military personnel will not be used to replace civilian personnel, nor shall we permit the intent of this directive to be circumvented by the use of temporary duty, detail of individuals from field activities (either within or outside of the Washington area), or by any similar actions.

"In order to insure that any civilian personnel reductions be implemented in an honest and efficient manner, I should like to point out that the Secretaries of the military departments have been specifically charged with the responsibility of surveying their activities and effecting this reduction by selected activity, rather than across the board, and in a manner calculated to cause the minimum interference with essential activities. I have personally discussed this aspect with the Secretaries and Chiefs of Staff, and emphasized the necessity for making this cut in those activities where cuts would be least disruptive.

"I wish to point out that the above step is, in my judgment, only the most recent evidence of the Department's sincere desire and continuing efforts to effect economy in the use of personnel. The savings in our end fiscal year 1951 civilian employment brought about by the establishment of manpower ceilings within the budgetary ceilings are an example of these efforts.

"Striking evidence is also available respecting economy in the use of military personnel. Through improved utilization, the Army expects to obtain two or three more divisions than were originally planned without increasing its requested end fiscal year 1952 strength of 1,552,000.

"I believe that these savings illustrate the Department's adherence to the principle that budgetary ceilings should not be thought of as floors, and that they should be treated as a limit, not a goal.

"We will continue to exert every effort to achieve maximum economy in the use of all Defense Department personnel and we

will appreciate your continuing interest and cooperation toward that end.

"Sincerely yours,

"ANNA M. ROSENBERG."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RILEY].

(Mr. RILEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT]. I am as jealous of the authority of Congress as any man here. I am as reluctant to delegate power to other groups as any man in this Chamber. The suggestion of the gentleman from New York is an excellent one, but I am afraid that it is not practical in this instance.

Congress has approved the sending of American soldiers as occupation troops to Germany and to Austria. Under article 2 of NATO which organization has been approved by Congress the Defense Department is sending troops to join with our friends in Europe for the defense of the industry and the natural resources of that great economy—which, of course, is in the interest and for the defense of the United States. The gentleman from New York said that under article 5 of the NATO agreement that if any member of the NATO organization were attacked then we could send additional troops to Europe. Suppose the attack comes through Austria and Germany, neither of whom are members of this organization? Is the gentleman from New York willing to allow American lives to be sacrificed and for those lands to be taken over by the enemy until he reaches some country in the NATO agreement? Is he willing for American troops to be out on the end of a limb and give opportunity to the enemy to saw that limb off? I remember that between World War I and World War II France built the great Maginot line. France had a fixed and known policy. What did the German troops do? They walked around the end of it; they did not even try to attack it.

We do not want any fixed policy when the lives of our American boys are at stake. We want to be in a position to defend our troops, to reinforce them as well as provide them with materials, should an emergency require it. We need an open and an elastic policy, and open-mindedness in our leadership. As far as I am concerned, I am not willing to abandon these boys that we are sending to Europe by saying to them, "You are going to have to do the best you can until the Congress can be called together to decide whether or not it is going to send you any reinforcements." I am not willing to have another Corregidor. As one of the gentlemen said a while ago, if we have no faith in the leadership of our Army, Navy, Marines, and Air Force, let us replace them; let us get men in whom we do have faith and let us go along with them. I have faith in our military leadership, myself. They consult with us. They are not going to commit troops on their own decision alone. But, let us

not bind ourselves to wait and debate when every hour might count. Let us leave the way open to protect our servicemen in foreign lands. I hope this amendment is defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMPSON].

(Mr. THOMPSON of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I take this time for the purpose of straightening out my own mind on certain of the background that I know the committee has studied most carefully. I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee if he will please tell me: As you deliberated, did any military man recommend any such limitation as is now proposed in this amendment?

Mr. MAHON. In response to the question I should like to say that no military man of any rank, of whom I know, has recommended to the committee, and, insofar as I know, no military man of any rank has recommended to Congress that there be a fixed, legislative limit on the number of troops sent to Europe. Let me say that this statement, insofar as I know, applies across the board to military men in and out of uniform. Let me say that perhaps the man who bears the greatest resentment against this administration and the Joint Chiefs of Staff has unequivocally, so I understand, stated that in his opinion it would be most unwise for Congress to fix any limitations on the number of troops to Europe.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. That, I believe, was General MacArthur.

Mr. MAHON. Another thing that should be made clear to the House is: How many American troops are provided for our force in Europe in the pending bill? This bill provides pay for about 344,000 United States troops for all of Europe. For the NATO countries it provides for 259,000, which includes six divisions. In addition there are something like 15,000 troops, I believe, in Austria, and by agreement there are about 5,000 troops in Trieste, and in General Eisenhower's headquarters and in other fields of activity there are about 5,000 more, and then there are about 60,000 Air Force troops who are rotated back and forth for training purposes to Europe. The over-all number of troops which General Collins said this morning we might expect in all of Europe during fiscal 1952, according to present plans, is about 344,000, and that is the number which has been given to the House this afternoon by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and myself, as the result of a brief hearing which was held this morning in order to get the very latest word on this matter.

CONCLUSION

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman. As the debate on this amendment has progressed, I have concluded that whatever the purpose behind it and however sincere its proponents may be, still it was definitely not based on sound military judgment.

One who has preceded me suggested that this amendment is the will of the people. I speak only for my own. In their behalf I want to say most emphatically that this would not suit them at all. They have repeatedly, and so far as I can recall unanimously, urged me to vote for any amount necessary for national defense. They are very strong for economy in Government, but they do not want to save dollars at the expense of national security.

I believe that the subcommittee headed by my distinguished colleague from Texas [Mr. MAHON] has carefully eliminated from this bill, as from all others, every unnecessary item. As they recommend it to us, I believe it is wise, and altogether necessary. I urge that the amendment be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] to close debate on the amendment.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, it should be pointed out that we do not have an unlimited number of men in uniform. It should be pointed out that we are providing in this bill, and only Congress can provide for the military force, a force in being during this year, for an Army, Navy, and Air Force of about 3,500,000 people. Of those about 1,500,000 are in the Army. If we denuded the Pacific of troops, if we took them all out of Korea, all out of Japan and the islands of the sea, and all out of the United States and the Caribbean and elsewhere, we could not send to Europe more than 1,500,000 without further congressional action. Nobody would dream of such rash action as that.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff have said that we will have, and we substantially have now, six divisions in Europe. There is now no plan to send any more than the six divisions to Europe. That force is being sent there after the whole matter has been very carefully worked out by the Joint Chiefs. As the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has read, General Collins, Chief of Staff of the Army, and nobody doubts the integrity or the authority of this man, has said that before any major change is made with respect to sending troops to Europe the appropriate committees of Congress will all be consulted in advance of the time the decision is made. I do not want to send too many American troops to Europe. I wish we did not have to send any. However, I think it would be most unwise to fix a number as a matter of law.

Can you imagine the men in the Kremlin making an edict or passing a law saying "We will not send more than six divisions of Russian troops to the satellite countries and to eastern Germany without further legislation"? Would the Kremlin contemplate for a moment any such legislation as that, and shout to the world what their plans were? They want to be able to rock with the punches and do what may be required in the twinkling of an eye. I shall not be one to tying the hands of this great country at this most crucial period, perhaps, in our history. I think the majority of the members of Congress share that resolve.

I was struck with the remarks of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK]

when he said, "Let us let the Kremlin worry about what we are going to do." I was pleased to see the applause, which indicated to me that the Members of the House are not going to tell the Kremlin just what the details of our plans are, nor are we going to tie General Eisenhower's hands behind him and say, "We are going to pass a no-confidence vote in you and try to undermine you, General Eisenhower, at the very time when a new spirit is blossoming in Europe and new hope is springing into the hearts of the free men of the world." No, a thousand times, no. A majority of the Members of Congress will not follow the lead of the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT], in this amendment. I respect the gentleman but I cannot concur with his views in offering the amendment.

I think there must be an utter lack of comprehension as to what world war III would probably be like. What would it be like? If such a war should start, which Heaven forbid, there probably would be no time for convening the Congress. There probably would be no declaration of war by the Kremlin. The bombs would begin to fall and whether they would fall here or somewhere else, there will not be any time for debate. Our war plans would have to be executed with the greatest haste. There would not be time to offer amendments and have debates. It is unthinkable to me that the House of Representatives would adopt the pending amendment, especially in the light of all the facts and circumstances. This is no time for timidity. This is no time to say, "We are afraid. We are afraid to say that we will send more than six divisions to Europe." Let us reserve the right to do what seems to be most appropriate as the events of the future unfold. I think that represents the attitude of the American people. We are confronted with 175 Russian divisions not far from Western Europe. We now have about six divisions there, and let us not tip our hand as to what we might later decide to do in an effort to promote peace and the security of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

All the time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. COUDERT) there were—ayes 84, noes 131.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 602. Section 3648, Revised Statutes, shall not apply, in the case of payments made from appropriations contained in this act, (1) to payments made in compliance with the laws of foreign countries or their ministerial regulations, (2) to payments for rent in such countries for such periods as may be necessary to accord with local custom, or (3) to payments made for tuition.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, what has been said to the Members of the House by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGLESWORTH], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has given me

great concern. I am just about convinced that the Congress of the United States has substantially lost control of the affairs of this country. When men of that type are forced to come into this well and tell us they are unable to get information from the military administrators, that detailed information is not forthcoming, that satisfactory answers to questions are not available, that is something for us to be concerned about. The debate on the amendment which has just failed of approval shows to me the utter confusion, the utter incapacity of the Congress of the United States to further control the affairs of this country. I am forced to the conclusion that much of this is due to the wide scope of our international program, to the various commitments that have been made through our State Department, and those who maneuver our diplomatic operations, and I have simply taken the floor as a means of publicly expressing my views so that the people, in my district at least, will know how I personally feel about it.

I repeat, I think we have substantially lost control of the affairs of this country, irrespective of how that may have occurred.

Here we have a \$56,000,000,000 appropriation bill, with a \$4,500,000,000 portion of the bill to come later, and with anywhere from 15 to 35 billion additional coming up for consideration before this Congress adjourns. We are in a position where no member of the Appropriations Committee, as far as I know, can stand on this floor and make a definite statement that is worth a nickel to anyone who really wants concrete information before voting on the proposition. I refer you to what the men have said. We are forced to accept this bill as it is presented or vote against all of the appropriations in the bill, and who wants to vote against all of the appropriations in the bill, with the commitments of this country as great as they are.

We had an illustration yesterday when someone brought into the debate the question of the \$307,000,000 for Chiang Kai-shek's government in Formosa, the so-called Nationalist Government of China. We have this perfectly fantastic provision which is in the Japanese Peace Treaty, which gives Japan the right to select one of the two Chinese governments with which it is to do business. It can select the Communist government or it can select the Nationalist government, if that treaty stands as it is now proposed. Suppose Japan selects the Communist government and throws its strength to the proposition of giving Formosa back to Communist China, what are you going to do about that? This \$307,000,000 proposal—and I am informed that that is another one of these leaks; that information should not have got out at all, that it is strictly confidential information; but it is public information and it has been published in the press and therefore we can talk about it, as I view the situation. Here is your over-all foreign aid and defense program, endorsed by all the proper departments of Government. I mean such as the State Department, Treasury Department, ECA, and so on. They endorse the program and then it must be approved by the

President. What are the elements or segments in that program, I do not know. There is not any way I can find out. Unless you are a member of a committee where you sit and listen to this confidential information, where you are practically sworn to secrecy, you cannot find out even though you are a Member of Congress. But the over-all program is endorsed by these various departments of Government; and I say this information has come to me from those departments since 8 o'clock this morning, but you are not supposed to know the details, and this \$307,000,000 item was one of the details, but prior to yesterday this item was not public information.

AID TO FORMOSA—THEN FORMOSA TO THE COMMUNISTS

Mr. Chairman, what may become one of the most fantastic proposals in current history is in the process of coming to light. It is alarming, and it may prove dangerous.

The press reports that the administration has asked the Congress to provide \$307,000,000 for an aid program for the Nationalist Chinese forces of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, located on the strategic island of Formosa.

The program includes some \$217,000,000 for arms shipments, reportedly designed to modernize an anti-Communist Chinese Army of between 25 and 30 divisions.

This program, as I understand, is a complete reversal of recent State Department policy. It is more significant and conclusive proof of the fact that the policy of the State Department is inconsistent and bungling, and therefore inimical to the best interests of the United States.

President Truman, Secretary Acheson, and their like-minded colleagues have done much in their power to hinder the Nationalist Chinese forces in the struggle against Mao Tse-tung's Moscow-directed Communist hordes. The Marshall-Stilwell plot to force Chiang off of the Chinese mainland and back to Formosa is well-known history.

In addition, for the past 14 months the United States Seventh Fleet has been located in the waters around Formosa for the express purpose not only of stopping Red aggression onto that island stronghold, but also for stopping any moves Chiang may wish to make against the Communists. The State Department calls this policy "neutralizing" Formosa.

Now, after years of deliberately thwarting Nationalist Chinese efforts to fight the Communists, it appears the State Department has decided to support a money grant for arming the Nationalists.

Included in this proposal, as I have stated, is a \$217,000,000 grant for military assistance. The present Defense Secretary, General Marshall, has consistently and steadfastly opposed aid to Chiang.

After the press announced yesterday that the administration had requested all this money for Chiang, I eagerly awaited a statement from Secretary Marshall. Is he completely reversing his policy, his

long-held views, on this subject? Or is he merely going along with Secretary Acheson because Mr. Acheson is running the show in the first place?

No statement was forthcoming.

Through contacting General Marshall's office, Mr. Felix Larkin, general counsel of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, raised the question of secrecy of information. He observed that the testimony about the entire Mutual Security Act was in secret. It appears someone leaked the information about China, or else it would still not be public.

Mr. Larkin declined to answer the direct question:

Is General Marshall now supporting this money request for Chiang, or isn't he?

Instead, Mr. Larkin said:

The whole programing under the proposed military aid under title 3 in the Mutual Security Act bill is classified information, and the Department of Defense has no comment on any stories that were in the papers today.

The news is out that the administration wants money for Chiang. All I want to know is what any citizen in Michigan or any other place is entitled to know: Is General Marshall for this \$307,000,000 proposal, or is he against it?

No answer. The information is secret. The Congress is being asked for the money, but the views of the Secretary of Defense cannot be given to a Member of Congress.

Mr. Bray, Deputy Assistant Director of Policy and Planning, International Security Affairs, State Department, observed this morning that the money for Nationalist China is but one item in the entire Mutual Security Act, and that the State Department is officially supporting the act.

But Mr. Bray's statement clearly indicates that the State Department—which means Secretary Acheson—has reversed its policy with respect to Chiang.

I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if it is not significant that the State Department's reversal of policy comes less than a month before the Japanese peace treaty is to be signed—September 4, in San Francisco.

As I pointed out in a lengthy statement on the House floor on August 2, there is a sleeper clause in the Japanese peace treaty which, in effect, might hand over Formosa to the Chinese Communists—the men who are this very moment slaughtering our fellow Americans on the tough battlefields of Korea.

There is a provision in this treaty which says that the Japanese Government, when it later gets around to making its peace treaty with China, can choose which Chinese government it will consider legitimate. Japan may deal with the Communist or the Nationalist Chinese Government.

Given that choice, Japan, on account of obvious trade advantages, is likely to choose Communist China.

If Japan deals with Communist China, it is most likely that Formosa will be handed over to Communist China, for Communist China would occupy the place of the victor at the diplomatic table, and Communist China's longing for Formosan soil is well known.

I do not say authoritatively that Japan will choose to deal with Communist China, but it is quite obvious that is more likely to be her choice. These are not "calculated risks"—these are strong possibilities which the security of the United States cannot afford to risk.

May I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that you consider these two issues side by side, in relation to each other.

On the one hand we see the State Department suddenly reversing its anti-Chiang stand, and urging an appropriation of tax dollars to help his government; on the other hand we have the very same State Department—supporting a peace treaty which opens the door wide for Formosa to fall into Communist clutches.

This policy indicates one or both of two things: Either the State Department is so utterly confused, and bewildered, and has spread itself so far that it cannot in one limited area of the globe permit its left hand to know what its right hand is doing; or else, the State Department is in the direction of handing over \$307,000,000 in American money or goods to the Communists, along with the island of Formosa, a vital defense barrier in the far Pacific.

On previous occasions the United States has been more or less sold out by the plotters of the State Department. The disgraces of Yalta, Tehran, Potsdam, and Cairo are recent memories. Our secret agreements giving Russia control of Manchuria, Outer Mongolia, Port Arthur, Dairen, and the Sakhalin and Kuril Islands are parts of this betrayal. The deal giving Russia industrialized Manchuria is not yet forgotten—Manchuria, which the North Korean Communists now use as a sanctuary from which to attack our American and South Korean troops.

The errors made in these agreements and secret deals will not soon be forgotten—we still pay for them dearly in American lives and American money.

Mr. Chairman, it is past time somebody took note of this matter. I call upon the Committee on Foreign Affairs to carefully consider the State Department's proposal.

If the American people cannot rely on the State Department to look after American interests, it becomes the obligation of the Congress to take the initiative.

Mr. Chairman, I ask permission to extend my remarks so that I may put in the RECORD some of the information I have picked up today and which was not given to me in confidence, and which further deals with this Japanese treaty proposal and this \$307,000,000 item.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, with all due respect to my friend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD], and in disagreement with him, yet having profound respect for his views, and with others with whom I may be in disagreement—and I hope they have respect for my views when

they disagree with me—I cannot permit the remarks of my friend to go unanswered. In my opinion, the majority of the House of Representatives in the Committee of the Whole on the vote just taken have made a very powerful and constructive contribution toward the ultimate objective which we all have in mind.

As I said here, my mind goes back before Pearl Harbor when those of us who advocated measures to prepare in case of attack were fighting a rearguard action. At that time public opinion emotionally aroused was against any affirmative measures. Fortunately the public opinion of America today is very strongly in favor of the Congress and our country taking strong measures in order to meet the dastardly challenge that confronts the world today. Public opinion today is entirely changed from what it was 11 years ago, and I think the people of America generally are far ahead of many of us who are Members of Congress, in recognition of the danger and in their recognition, in fact, insistence, that we take all steps necessary to develop our power: First, to be prepared for attack in case it comes; and second, as a deterrent for any attack, because our people recognize the fact that the only thing that the Communist rulers and others obsessed with such a dastardly disease, destructive beyond imagination, is what they fear, and that is power greater than they possess. I think the Committee of the Whole in its wisdom acted properly in voting against the amendment which was offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT]—and I respect him. I would have him understand that I think his views and his motives are noble and high-minded, but I think the majority of the Committee of the Whole acted wisely in rejecting the amendment, because the adoption of the amendment might have had harmful results throughout the world. You notice I said “results.” Results not intended, but we have got to consider results which might flow from an act just as well as the intent that might be involved.

In view of the remarks of the gentleman from Michigan, I take the floor so that the RECORD will show, speaking for those who voted against the amendment, and I refer to Members on both sides of the aisle—Republicans voted against it as well as Democrats—they acted wisely in connection with the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT]. As majority leader of the House—I have said this before and I repeat it now—I am proud, very proud, of the high level of debate that the membership of the House has engaged in on this bill and has engaged in on bills of all nature, particularly those relating to our foreign affairs.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, there are controversial issues, I recognize that, and within them there are controversial questions, but the membership of the House, and I refer to Members on both sides of the aisle, have always engaged in a very high level of debate in expressing the views as they entertained them and have acted in a manner which we of today can be proud when the historians of tomorrow might read about our debates.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COUDERT. I want to thank the gentleman for his kind words.

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, they are honest words.

Mr. COUDERT. I appreciate that. I would like to ask the gentleman a question. The gentleman is pleased that the House has refrained from imposing any legal restrictions on the military to move troops abroad?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is a fair way of putting it.

Mr. COUDERT. Is the gentleman, as majority leader of this House, in a position to give assurance to the Members of the House that no more than six divisions will be sent abroad to the NATO army to implement article 3 without approval of the Congress?

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, the gentleman from Massachusetts is in no position to give any assurance, and if anybody informed the gentleman from Massachusetts that he had authority to give such assurance, the gentleman from Massachusetts, as an American and as a Member of Congress, in light of world conditions, would object to any such promises or instructions, and I would vigorously fight them. Our military leaders are human beings, but they are men, and we have to look to them in this emergency, and in case of war we will have to look to them to lead our Army, our Navy, our Air Force, and our Marine Corps. As an American, as a Member of Congress, I am in no position where I can very well challenge their views and I have got to repose confidence in them.

Mr. COUDERT. That means, then, that the gentleman is entirely satisfied to permit the military to send a million men abroad?

Mr. McCORMACK. Within the military field. I recognize the importance of their judgment and I recognize that we have got to turn to them within military fields and receive their judgment. We should give full and complete recognition to these men who have given their entire life in the military service of our country, and respond to the positions of leadership and to the success of our country in case of war.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has again expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

(Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, it is a very frank admission that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], our majority leader, has made. As I heard it, as I understand it, and he sits here—and correct me if I am in error—it means this and no more than this: That the destiny of our Nation, so far as he is concerned and so far as the Congress is concerned, has been turned over and put in the hands of the military men. That is what it amounts to if you will read it tomorrow and if it goes into the RECORD as he said it.

I do not subscribe to that doctrine at all. We need no military dictatorship in this country to win the present or any other war—dictatorship by an Eisenhower, a Marshall, a Rosenberg, a State Department, or an Acheson. The Congress of the United States has some responsibility on the question of whether we declare war, whether we fight a war, and when and where we fight it, and for what purpose. I just cannot and I will not go along with the idea that the military men or the Secretary of State or the Department of State are to take over my responsibility or are to speak for me. They, and I mean the Marshall-Acheson group under Truman, have gotten us into this mess, into this war.

I remember the argument that was made before Pearl Harbor, and to which the gentleman referred. And, what was it? That every time we were asked to appropriate a dollar or enact legislation, we were told by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], by the Committee on Foreign Relations, yes, and by some Republican members of that—by the Deweys, the Stassens—that the purpose was to keep us out of war. And, all the time the real underlying effect was to get us into war. And that is what has been doing this time. Once again we are fighting, will continue to fight, if some have their way—to protect England's trade dollars. This bill today carries \$56,000,000,000, and much of it will be used for the success of the Democratic ticket in 1952. Now, like it or not, it will be, and you know it will, and a lot of the legislation that has been passed and many a dollar that has been appropriated has been used for that purpose. Why do I say that? Because of the experience we had before. I have not forgotten when Federal money was passed out in Pennsylvania to the farmers at the polls, and they were told where their interest was, who buttered their bread—but no one claimed any credit for sending their sons to fight abroad. Now it is the same old story: Frighten the people, get us into a war, and then come along under the guise of national defense and ask for billions more. Billions for the Armed Forces to spend to fight the wars, defend ourselves in the wars in which United States or Acheson may involve us. Read the editorial in the Saturday Evening Post this week. I have often wondered why it is that the fellow who is so close to the soil, who by some standards knows so little, who never has had a college or university education, is always in the forefront, is the first when

it comes to recognizing the truth. Read that editorial. Here is a professor of the University of Chicago, Dr. Hans J. Morgenthau, a distinguished scholar, who takes the time to write a book, yes, a whole book to tell us what Castle-reagh, Palmerston, John Hay, Queen Elizabeth, Bismarck, yes, and every American who ever earned his own living by growing food out of Mother Earth, or by working in mill, mine, or factory, or behind a counter has always known, that self-preservation is the first law of nature followed by man and nation if survival be the purpose. And what was it this great scholar took a book to tell us? Something our internationalists, our do-gooders never learn. That every nation in the world, from the beginning of history down to today except the United States, has always followed a policy which had, as its primary objective purpose, the welfare of its people, the interest, the advancement and security of that nation.

The doctor's main thesis, as stated by the Post, is that our policy both for Europe and for Asia should not be ideological, theological, or sentimental but should promote the security and interest of the United States. How absurd, how narrow that thought must be to our internationalists, to some of the members of our Committee on Foreign Relations—but it is a thought—it is truth which is in the mind of every sound-thinking American. The Post editor concludes with this:

In other words, it is idiotic to talk about defense of morality (and I might add, the freedom of other nations) if that means stripping ourselves, by aimless dispersions of power, of the ability to defend anything.

Now, I ask you, read that editorial and, if you have time, read the book, and then see if you have learned anything that you did not know before—had you paused to think—which was, and which is today, that it is our duty to think first of our people, of our country, and not of these other nations, whose burdens we have been carrying and will always carry as long as we are willing and they can induce us to do so.

When you have read the editorial and the book you will not have learned anything you did not know before, which has not, from the well of the House where I am now speaking, been said over and over again by some of us. Neither the majority of the Congress nor the administration would listen and today we are in world war III, forced to appropriate \$56,000,000,000 as part payment on our folly.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill be considered as read, that it be open for amendment, and that points of order be reserved.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair makes inquiry whether there are any points of order to any of the remaining sections of the bill.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I have a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of the opinion that we should dispose of the points of order first. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against section 628 of the bill, page 63, on the ground that it is legislation in an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, this section places a limitation on expenditures in an appropriation bill. From the viewpoint of the committee, it is in order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas desire to be heard further on his point of order?

Mr. TEAGUE. It is true that the first few lines of the section do impose a limitation, but I think it is also obvious and true that the latter part of the section changes the basic law and imposes legislation upon an appropriation bill.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be pleased to hear the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, the provision is a clear limitation and it is not new legislation. There is no new legislation in it. The provisos are specific and do not require additional duties. It is a clear limitation within the rules of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

The gentleman from Texas makes a point of order against section 628 of the bill on the ground that it contains legislation.

The Chair is of the opinion that while the section purports to be a limitation on the appropriation it does, especially in the language beginning on page 63, lines 16, 17, and 18, impose additional duties and responsibilities upon the Secretary of Defense. The Chair is therefore of the opinion that it is legislation on an appropriation bill, and sustains the point of order.

Are there further points of order?

If there are no further points of order, the Chair will recognize Members who have amendments at the Clerk's desk. First, however, the Chair will recognize the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] to strike out the last word.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I recognize the spirit of the House at this time, and I hesitate to impose myself further on your good nature.

A Member of Congress can afford to give up many things, but he cannot afford to give up his self-respect. I have been a little disturbed by some of the intimations which have been made to the effect that nobody knows what is in this bill, that we had to vote for it blindly because we were afraid not to vote for it, the issue of national defense being involved. I hope the fact that members of the subcommittee have been critical of some of the operations of the Department of

Defense has not misled the House. The fact that we have been critical and have singled out various instances of bad management and waste should indicate to Members of the House that a very thorough and careful study has been made of the whole military program. It was upon the basis of this careful probing that various reductions were made in the bill. As I have said before, we devoted 11 long weeks to hearings on this bill.

It was because of the work of the committee that various conclusions have been reached and various suggestions have been made. Our studies led to numerous recommendations in the committee report which is available to the House, and numerous reductions in the interest of efficiency.

Now, there is no reason not to be realistic. It is utterly impossible for any man in Congress or in the Department of Defense to know everything about the far-flung ramifications of the defense program and of defense spending. The program is so big that no human brain would be capable of grasping every detail and fact associated with so gigantic an effort. This is not a confession of weakness on the part of Congress; it is simply a statement of human limitations.

Yet no Member need say that he knows nothing about this bill. It would be most ridiculous and absurd, and it would certainly be a confession of lack of diligence for him to say that he knew nothing about this bill. Obviously, all Members know something about the bill; but, of course, it is perfectly understandable that Members generally, in fact, no Member could possibly know every minute detail of a \$56,000,000,000 military program.

I hold in my hand 3,500 pages of printed testimony containing more information about this legislation than has perhaps been given about any other bill at this session of Congress. The report contains a wealth of information with respect to every major phase of defense spending.

Of course, you cannot predict everything that will happen on your farm or in your business or in the Government or in the Department of Defense in advance but, certainly, if there ever was information available about any bill that has ever been considered by the Congress in its history, there is information available about this bill. Again I say here are 3,500 pages of information that is available and here is the report which has been available to Members for several days. Why should Members make reference to unfamiliarity with respect to over-all defense spending when we have such voluminous information which is available? Moreover, the bill itself consists of 65 pages. Certainly, those who complain that they know nothing about the bill have certainly read the bill itself very carefully, and have studied it.

Let Members also remember that those sturdy Americans, those rugged individualists who refuse to move from a position when they think they are right—let them remember that such men as JOHN TABER, RICHARD WIGGLESWORTH, ERRETT SCRIVNER, HARRY SHEPPARD, BOB

SIKES, and JOHN RILEY, worked for weeks and months in the preparation of this bill. Of course, none of us is fully satisfied with the measure, but do you think the committee would have come in with the bill unless people like that knew something about it?

There is no easy way to find out what you are going to do, Mr. Chairman, with \$56,000,000,000. You have to work hard and long and burn the midnight oil.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman knows the affection I hold for him. He has just made a statement that all Members of the House ought to know what is in this bill because they have had the opportunity of reading a report which the gentleman just said took his subcommittee 11 weeks to complete.

Mr. MAHON. Yes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. How in the name of heaven can you expect the average Member, in a few short hours, to master that which has taken you 11 weeks of hearings to produce? It is an impossibility, and it is unfair to expect any Member of the House to be able to do it.

Mr. MAHON. I do not think it is possible for every Member of the House to know fully what is in the bill. All Members are very busy with heavy responsibilities and they cannot possibly read all committee hearings. I think our committee system more or less takes care of that situation. There is no abler Member of the House than my friend, the gentleman from Ohio, and I am in no way critical of him or any other Member.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Then, let us not criticize them.

Mr. MAHON. Oh, no, I am in no way critical—of course, it is impossible for Members to read all committee hearings of various committees. My point was that Members who sought more information about the pending measure could get a fairly good picture by scanning the hearings and reading essential parts of the report.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. If the Members had 11 weeks to review that which has taken you 11 weeks to produce, I think perhaps most of them might know as much about it as the gentleman knows, but we have not had 11 weeks.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct. No; Members have not had 11 weeks and unfortunately, I do not know of any way that Members could have had that much time.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Then, please do not hold us responsible.

Mr. MAHON. I think Members are doing the best they can with a very difficult situation. The 158-page report does give them a good source of information, but I have no desire to discount the difficulties.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VAN ZANDT:
Page 52, line 9, insert "(a)" after "SEC. 604."

On page 52, insert after line 11 the following new matter:

"(b) No part of any appropriation contained in this act for 'Pay and allowances' of military personnel shall be expended for the pay or allowances, accruing after November 30, 1951, of any member of the Inactive or Volunteer Reserve who served on active duty for a period of 12 months or more in any branch of the Armed Forces during the period beginning December 7, 1941, and ending September 2, 1945, if such member shall have served on active duty for a period of 12 months or more after June 26, 1950, unless such member shall have voluntarily consented to remain on active duty.

"(c) No part of any appropriation contained in this act or any other act shall be expended for the pay or allowances, or for benefits under part I or part II of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, as the case may be, of any member of the Armed Forces serving on active duty if such member was receiving benefits under part I or part II of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, at the time he was ordered to active duty."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment, but I will reserve it until the gentleman has concluded his remarks.

(Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, on the 7th day of June, when we considered the conference report on the Senate bill No. 1, now Public Law 51, we found that the conferees had agreed to a period of 17 months of active duty on the part of Inactive and Volunteer Reserves who had been called to active duty involuntarily against their own wishes.

As a matter of information, when the House approved Senate bill No. 1, commonly called the UMT bill, it provided that the Inactive and Volunteer Reserves called to active duty against their own wishes would be required to serve 12 months. The Senate bill, when it passed the Senate, did not contain any provision whatsoever. So the conferees recommended the 17 months period of service. During the debate the chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services [Mr. VINSON] stated that in a few weeks the Department of Defense would send to the House Committee on Armed Services a bill providing a new Reserve policy and that it would be certain to correct any injustice that was being done to the Inactive and Volunteer Reserves. The House Committee on Armed Services has received that bill, and there is nothing in it that will correct any injustice which has been done to the Inactive and Volunteer Reserves.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman is a member of the committee that is now conducting hearings on that bill.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That is correct.

Mr. VINSON. Is there anything that will prohibit him from carrying out the statement I made, that we could correct it in the Reserve bill, which the gentleman is holding hearings on now?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I can reply to your question by saying that the bill you have in mind may not reach the floor of the

House for possibly a month and it may not pass the Senate for another month. In the meantime these Inactive and Volunteer Reserves are being retained on active duty.

Mr. Chairman, what I am trying to do is provide relief to a group of Americans who served during World War II for more than 12 months, and who joined the Inactive and Volunteer Reserves of our Armed Forces with the understanding they would not be called except in case of war. Unknown to these Inactive and Volunteer Reserves, the Congress of the United States amended the Selective Service Act of 1948 and provided that not only would their enlistment be extended for a period of 12 months, but they could be called up to active duty. Mind you these Inactive and Volunteer Reserves attended no drills, received no summer training, or pay. They were literally reservists on paper. When Mrs. Rosenberg, Assistant Secretary of National Defense, appeared before the House Committee on Armed Services she confessed that the law had been administered poorly. She confessed that the Department of Defense had treated the Inactive and Volunteer Reserves of this country in a shameful manner. Yet they are still on active duty, and there is no Member of this House who has not received a letter, or numerous letters, telling him about the discrimination that the Inactive and Volunteer Reserves have been subjected to in being separated from his family, his civilian occupation, or his business while Organized Reserves who attend summer training and weekly drills and receive pay for them remain at home with thousands of young men of draft age walking the streets.

Mr. Chairman, what does my amendment do? It provides that on the 30th day of November, 24 days before Christmas, because of the fact that no portion of this appropriation can be used to pay a Volunteer or Inactive Reserve who has had more than 12 months of active duty he must be separated and returned to inactive duty. I say to the members of this committee, if you want to recognize a group of Americans who have already made their contribution in World War II, and who are being forced to make another contribution in world war III—and I consider the Korean War world war III—and if you want to help the Reserves in the future, I urge that you pass this amendment and return these boys to their homes for Christmas Day 1951.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. How does this help the reserves, by cutting off their pay?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. It means that the armed services will have to return them to inactive duty by November 30, because they cannot be retained on active duty without pay.

Mr. COOLEY. That does not necessarily have to follow. I think the gentleman's purpose is right, but to cut off a man's pay seems to be a very awkward way of accomplishing what he desires.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. It is the only way it can be done. As I mentioned previ-

ously we tried to correct the intolerable conditions when the UMT conference report was on the floor but because of the parliamentary situation amendments were barred.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. The effect of the gentleman's amendment would be to repeal a provision in the Draft Act.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Not necessarily.

Mr. VINSON. That is exactly the effect of it, because the result is that it will force the Department to do either one of two things: Turn them out in 12 months or hold them without pay.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. They will not hold them because, under existing law, military personnel ordered to active duty must be in a pay status.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. If it has the effect of repealing that provision in the Draft Act, it ought to be done, anyway.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Definitely so.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COUDERT. I am entirely in sympathy with the objective that the gentleman has in mind, but I wonder if he can tell the committee what effect this would have on the armed services as of today—whether it would release so many men that it would make many of the units of the armed services impotent.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. When I considered introducing my amendment I took that into consideration, and that is the reason for establishing the date of November 30. At the present time there is a rotation program under way. There is, in addition, a program providing for the release of reserves under this program. They are releasing so many thousands every month. Among those released are inactive and volunteer reserves. Therefore, on November 30 a great majority of inactive and volunteer reserves who were called during July and August of last year will be released under the 17-month provision which is a maximum, and not a minimum, period of service.

It is now August 9 and we are giving the armed services nearly 4 months' notice to call up paid reservists and draftees to replace the inactive and the volunteer reservists. Therefore, the results of my amendment in returning to inactive duty the inactive and volunteer reserve will in no manner disrupt the Armed Forces of our country. It will, however, in a small measure let the inactive and the volunteer reserves know that Congress recognizes the shameful treatment accorded them and is making a ninth-inning attempt to correct a situation that should have never developed.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I had reserved a point of order against the amendment, but it seems to be clearly a limitation on the pay of certain military personnel and I think it is not sub-

ject to a point of order. I therefore withdraw the point of order.

I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the point of order is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to be recognized in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I hope the committee will vote down this amendment.

The question propounded by the distinguished hero from Wake Island was very pertinent. This amendment would have the effect absolutely of practically destroying a great many elements, particularly in the Navy.

I offered this amendment in the committee when we were considering the draft bill because I was very anxious to do what was right and proper for the inactive and voluntary reservists, and I fixed the period of service at 12 months.

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. TOWE. The gentleman's amendment was not the one that was approved by the House; the one that was approved by the House was the one offered by the gentleman from New Jersey now interrogating the gentleman.

Mr. VINSON. That is right.

Mr. TOWE. The gentleman's amendment provided that they be turned out if it was convenient to do so.

Mr. VINSON. That is right. I withdraw that statement and give the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Towe] full credit, but the issue was brought up in the committee at my suggestion.

Admiral Sherman pointed out that to do what is proposed by that amendment would completely destroy a great many units in the Navy; it would be utterly impossible to administer without great military damage. So when we went to conference we reached the decision to limit their length of service to 17 months, and the services are trying to get out the Inactive Reserves now. If you adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania the effect would be to force out immediately every one of the inactive and voluntary reservists who are now in service because the Army could not pay them, the Navy could not pay them, the Air Force could not pay them; and, certainly, therefore, you could not hold them involuntarily in the Armed Services.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The gentleman will certainly agree that there are literally thousands of Organized Reserves who have not yet been called, and who are receiving drill pay and expect to be called.

Mr. VINSON. That is true.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Why were they not called instead of the Inactive and Volunteer Reserves.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman understands my position on that. I think the services made a mistake in not calling first the Organized Reserves instead of the Voluntary Reserves. By what this here would do is force the Departments to turn reserves out immediately, within 12 months; and the effect of it would be that half of your Army would come out of Korea, half of it would come out of Germany, and a large number of reserves would have to come out of the Navy. So I trust this amendment will be defeated.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The interim report submitted to the Congress by the Brooks subcommittee shows that as of April 1, 1951, there was a total of 360,000 reserves on active duty and the majority of them are represented by the National Guard divisions, and the Organized Reserve units of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps leaving literally only a handful of individuals called to active duty from the Inactive and Volunteer Reserves.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman is a member of a subcommittee that I appointed, headed by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Brooks], to make a study of the reserve program, and this question should be dealt with in that legislation. The gentleman has ample opportunity to offer an amendment in the committee and to bring the proposal back to the House in proper form.

I certainly trust you will not force the Department to do one of two things: Either hold them by the back of the neck or else take them and turn them loose after the 12 months is out. This amendment will destroy your services; you will destroy a great many units of your Navy if you adopt the Van Zandt amendment.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Is there any way we can tell the ultimate effect of this amendment?

Mr. VINSON. Yes; you can predict the ultimate effect of this amendment; it will take out of the service every man who is a volunteer or inactive reservist who served 12 months; you would take hundreds of thousands out almost by tomorrow morning.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Wier].

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, this is one amendment I am very happy to support. This matter has been a terrible headache to me since last August. I have had over 75 requests from young fellows who had just established themselves in civilian life after paying the price during many years of service in World War II, leaving families behind, leaving obligations behind and suffering undue hardships.

My experience has not been a happy one with the three military services. When Members here say that we are

going to wreck the Army, Navy, and Air Force by the withdrawal of these inactive reservists, I do not think they can sustain that position. I remember well the arguments advanced by the Committee on Military Affairs when this was introduced as a part of the Selective Service Act. We were pacified by lip service here that something would be done about it.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIER. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. TACKETT. Neither the Army nor the Defense Department intends to call any replacements and they do not intend to carry out the rotation system until this Congress makes them do it. I know of no better way than through this amendment.

Mr. WIER. I appreciate the gentleman's support. This is the experience I am running into so far as the Army, Navy, and Air Force are concerned. They were lenient during the months of June and July. They had a program outlined for the release of inactive reservists and they began to release them. The number involved is nowhere near enough to destroy any army we have, any division we have or any corps we have. The Army, Navy, and Air Force have admitted this should be done and they have submitted the figures as to those who would be discharged beginning in May, June, July, August, and September.

What has happened? I go down to the Navy or Army now with a request for the discharge of an inactive reservist. They say: "No, we reserve the right to extend it another year." That is the position they are taking now, reserving another year of service for these inactive reservists, beginning in November of this year.

I hope that the House does adopt this amendment because we will put the military authorities on their sincerity in the Selective Service Act with regard to release of the inactive reservists, and this is the only way you are going to get them out.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I was the one who offered the amendment to the Selective Service Act having to do with inactive and volunteer veteran reservists which was adopted by the House. When that bill went to conference, despite assurances on the part of the managers of the House, that the 12-months period of service would be retained, it came back to the House with an increase to 17 months. That is further proof that administration leaders have been playing political football with the inactive and volunteer veteran reservists. This amendment will stop at least some of the rotten abuses that have been heaped on the Reserves.

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey, a member of the House Armed Services Committee.

Mr. TOWE. Not only was it increased to 17 months but they reinserted the provision that was in the original committee bill that they would be turned out if it suited the pleasure of the Defense Department. I would like to say, Mr. Chairman, that the only way the Defense Establishment will ever do this job properly and turn men out who ought to be turned out is for this amendment or a similar one to be adopted. I hope the pending amendment will be adopted.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from New Jersey is, as usual, expressing his real interest in the servicemen of this country, and I commend him.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, author of the amendment and another member of the House Armed Services Committee who does more than give lip-service to our servicemen.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. It has been said here that this will wreck our national defense. It will not. Let me point out that the majority of the Reserves in active duty today are represented by the National Guard divisions, by the aviation units and by other units that have been called up. The Inactive and Involuntary Reserves represent the individual who has been called in. I daresay there are not more than 15,000 of them in the services today.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. I want to assure the gentleman from Iowa that my views are in entire accord with those of the gentleman from Pennsylvania. In fact, I offered an amendment to the recently enacted military manpower bill that would have helped Inactive and Volunteer Reserves to a great extent. That amendment should have been passed and this amendment should be likewise adopted at the present time.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman from Michigan, a veteran of World War II.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to read one brief statement from the Brooks subcommittee report which was made recently and which followed an investigation of the recall and release of reservists.

There can be no doubt that the Department of Defense is well aware of the foregoing for Mrs. Anna Rosenberg, Assistant Secretary of Defense, in an exchange of remarks with Congressman DEWEY SHORT, of Missouri, before the Armed Services Committee, said as follows:

Secretary ROSENBERG. When the last World War ended, Congressman SHORT, men took on an obligation to enter an active Reserve component. Those men have been paid for their training and in normal times they are the men to be called after the regular armed services. I agree with you 100 percent, the men called have been the ones on the inactive Reserve and not the ones on the active Reserve.

Then the subcommittee, taking note of the long train of abuses of the reservists, said this:

A partial rectification for the errors can be made by an early release of all reservists serving on active duty involuntarily.

Mr. Chairman, that is precisely what this amendment seeks to accomplish. It is impossible for me to understand how Mr. VINSON, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, can oppose this amendment which seeks only to carry out a recommendation of one of his own subcommittees. Decent treatment for the Reserves is long overdue. I certainly hope this amendment is adopted.

[Mr. SIKES addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlemen from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MAHON) there were—ayes 110, noes 94.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. VAN ZANDT and Mr. MAHON.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 122, noes 102.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CURTIS of Missouri: On page 62, line 11, strike out "\$25,000,000" and insert "\$10,000,000."

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, first I want to pay tribute for the work done by the chairman of this very able committee and all of the members of the committee. I do not believe anyone in the House, for a minute, is in any doubt of the fine work this committee put in in preparing this bill. The question that has been raised is, of course, what tools the committee has had in order to accomplish their job. I must say that a staff of two with possibly a few additional part-time helpers is hardly sufficient assistance to consider carefully a \$56,000,000 bill. I have noticed the 3,500 pages of these hearings, but I also notice that every witness who has appeared, and I went down the line pretty carefully, was from the Military Establishment. Those appearing before the committee, in other words, were presenting their point of view with no opposing witness.

In considering any appropriation bill, it seems to me there are two things that are essential. First is the consideration of whether we can afford it. This country is in debt. This country owes \$260,000,000,000. If we want to look for the cause of inflation, which every one of us agrees we have to fight, let us first look to that \$260,000,000,000. If we pass this \$56,000,000,000 bill today we are going to go into deficit financing some more, and we are going to increase the causes of inflation. The second thing in an appropriation bill that we want to look at is whether or not the various items are justified and are necessary. In my opinion, that has not been done on this particular bill.

There is not a Member of the House, in my opinion, who does not deep down within him know that the appropriations for the military in the bill can be cut, and cut considerably. In St. Louis we whipped a smoke condition. It was not done by any particular panacea, nor was it done by any waving of a wand. It was done by an inspection of each and every little chimney which was contributing to the smoke condition. In this particular bill I found one little chimney—one little chimney that I happen to know a little something about as a result of our work on the Bonner subcommittee with reference to Government surplus property. The item on page 62, section 625, calls for \$25,000,000 to assist the military in their salvage and scrap program, and the selling of equipment which they no longer can use. Right off the bat, I want to point out this particular item was not even studied by the subcommittee. There has been nothing done on it at all.

The best proof of that is that when you compile the three items that make up the \$25,000,000, you find that they add up to only \$17,000,000. So, in the first place, \$8,000,000 of the proposed \$15,000,000 saving is admitted. The military budgets only \$17,000,000, not \$25,000,000. An additional \$7,000,000 saving comes from this: We have been conducting a program trying to encourage the military to utilize more and more of their surplus property and have less for salvage and scrap. The three branches, the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force have assured us they are going along with that program. Judging from the items, it is true that the Air Force is. In 1951 they had a budget of \$4,900,000. This year they have cut it to \$3,000,000. On the other hand, the Army has done nothing about it. They had \$10,000,000 last year and they are asking for \$10,000,000 this year. The Navy, on the other hand, is increasing its budget from \$1,792,000 to \$4,000,000, an increase of over \$2,000,000.

So, applying the formula that the Air Force has used to cut back its program, which they should do in the name of economy, we actually would be saving the difference between \$10,000,000 and \$6,000,000 for the Army. Cutting the Navy back from \$4,000,000 to the \$1,000,000, which would be a similar cut, based on what they had spent in 1951, and we have a total of \$7,000,000 of saving to add to the \$8,000,000 that the military admit they do not need.

That is the basis on which I have proposed cutting this figure from \$25,000,000 to \$10,000,000. It is a program that the armed services themselves say they will embark upon, and I suggest that the Congress implement that program by cutting this item.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] has expired.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we can come to some agreement on limitation of debate on this amendment.

Mr. TABER. I wonder if the committee could not accept the amendment? It seems to be a pretty reasonable amendment.

Mr. SIKES. I am afraid the committee could not accept the amendment.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that debate on this amendment be limited to 5 minutes, the last 2½ minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Reserving the right to object, the gentleman heard the statement of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS]. Is he right about his figure?

Mr. SIKES. That is not the information that the committee has.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. You mean the gentleman is wrong in his addition?

Mr. SIKES. That is not the information given to us by the military officials. I will touch on that in a moment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks at the conclusion of the vote on the Curtis amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

[Mr. SIKES addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. Time for debate on this amendment has been fixed.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Then, Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken.

(Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, if I understand this amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri, it all depends on whether or not certain items have been added correctly. Am I wrong about that?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Eight million dollars of it is that.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. What is that?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Eight of the fifteen millions saving is just a matter of addition.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Do you mean that when they add these items mentioned in this paragraph of the bill instead of getting twenty-five they get eight million less?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. They get \$8,000,000 less.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If that is so, I do not understand why we do not accept the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. MAHON. You can have a \$1,000,000 salvage program; you can have a \$10,000,000 salvage program. This proposes a \$25,000,000 salvage program. You might very advantageously up it to a \$50,000,000 salvage program in order to channel into industry all this scrap material which never will be used by the Army and industry is crying for it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Then why do you have any items at all? Why do you not say that you want \$25,000,000 for a salvage program rather than to put in these three items, if that is the committee's purpose.

Mr. MAHON. It is just a \$25,000,000 program for salvage, but there are many millions of dollars in excess of that where the salvage must take place at some future time or else it is going to be lost.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. As the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER] said, I cannot understand why you put these three items in at all and then ask for more than they total.

Mr. MAHON. Please do not be misled; this is only a \$25,000,000 program. It could be a larger salvage program. Other portions of the program will be included in future years.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is not the point. You are asking for three items which total \$17,000,000, but instead of asking for \$17,000,000 you ask for \$25,000,000. Then why do you ask for more than the total of your items?

Mr. MAHON. There will be many millions of dollars in succeeding years for a salvage program.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I know that; that part is all right. That is not the point here.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. On page 153, as I understand it, if the gentleman from Texas will look at his own report, he will find an item of \$10,000,000 for this particular special account for the Army, on page 157 he will find an item for the Air Force of \$3,000,000 and up above for preparation of salvaged material for the Navy he will find an item of \$4,000,000, which makes a total of \$17,000,000, just as the gentleman from Missouri said. I cannot understand why we should not go by the report.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. When the garage or grocery store sends me a bill and the items they ask me to pay do not total up to the total of the bill they present, I just send them a check for the items they bill me. I cannot see why the amendment is not good. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] is to be commended for the very careful study of this bill—his industry has saved at least for the present \$8,000,000, no small amount even today.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my motion.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Chairman, the pending bill granting appropriations to the Defense Department for the fiscal year ending next June 30 gives me great concern. This bill calls for an appropriation of \$56,000,000,000. It is hard for the average person to grasp the magnitude and significance of such a figure. It means, excluding Sundays and holidays, more than \$1 a day for every man, woman, and child in the United States. In this time of high costs, the enactment of this measure will be the single most inflationary force operating on our economy.

Almost all Americans, and practically every Member of Congress, is fully aware of the vital need for a strong Defense Establishment. The threat which Russian Communist imperialism brings to our way of life and to the destiny of freedom is too real and too near to be ignored. We have our difficulties in this country and in this Congress on how to cope with this threat. Yet we are all in agreement on two things: Communism directed by the Kremlin is the real enemy, and our own military strength is vital for our own survival.

All of us know that there is a substantial amount of waste in the various military services. This point cannot be ignored or questioned by any man or woman who has ever served in any military branch. I do not blame this waste entirely on our military leaders. They are fundamentally trained for war, and war by its very nature is wasteful. Regardless of the curriculum that a young man might pursue at West Point or Annapolis, he is trained primarily to lead troops into battle or to lead an air mission against the enemy, or to command a ship at sea in time of war. He is not trained to cut costs or to construct and live within a budget that is related to the gross national product or the total Federal income. One does not have to be a management engineer or an efficiency expert to find waste and duplication of effort in the Pentagon, or in any navy yard, army base, or air field. The fiscal control of the military rests with the Congress, and, therefore, the responsibility for the elimination of waste is, to a great extent, ours. Yet, in view of the huge Military Establishment which we of necessity must maintain at present, it is almost impossible for us, as Members of Congress, to adequately discharge this responsibility.

The subcommittee which has held lengthy hearings on this appropriation has worked diligently and tirelessly for more than 6 months. Yet it is impossible for these able men to do more than call upon the military to justify their requests for funds. The committee staff is limited and can do no more than dig into the figures as presented. I feel sure that a staff of experts responsible to the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives could uncover countless examples of waste and could justify its cost by more than 100 times over.

The Appropriations Committee, through its various subcommittees, has spent thousands of hours in attempting to cut the colossal budget requested by the President in January. We, in the House, have made certain additional cuts. Some of us feel proud of the economies effected, especially in view of the arrogant challenge of President Truman when he dared the Congress to cut his budget. Yet all the cuts that we have made and all that we will make will not add up to as much as 4 percent of the amount of this military budget alone.

Mr. Chairman, this House might well authorize the employment of 100 expert investigators, at a salary of \$12,500 each. This would make a total expense of \$1,250,000. These men would not stay in Washington but would travel constantly throughout the year, visiting the various military installations both at home and abroad. Let us assume a travel and subsistence expense of \$150 per week for each man. On a basis of 50 weeks, this would total three-fourths of a million dollars per year. The information collected by these experts would have to be assembled and presented to the members of the subcommittee handling the military appropriation so that they could effectively exercise the economies indicated. Let us assume a cost for this clerical help and office expense of \$800,000 per year. This brings us to a total figure of \$2,800,000.

Two million eight hundred thousand dollars is one two-hundredth of 1 percent of the total military budget for the current fiscal year. Expressed in more understandable language, it is less than 1½ cents per year for every man, woman, and child in the country as opposed to more than \$1 per day for each man, woman, and child, which is the total cost for the defense budget.

I do not propose here another Federal bureau within the executive department. I merely propose a substantial expansion of the staff of the Subcommittee on Armed Services of the House Appropriations Committee. As I have already stated, these investigators must not sit behind a desk in Washington. I propose a continuing field study of all of our military establishments, wherever they might be located.

If these experts can show us how to save 1 percent in the operation of our military branch, they will have earned their expenses by more than 200 times. If the savings are as much as 5 percent, the investment will be returned to the taxpayer 1,000 times over. Now it is inconceivable to me that if these men are properly selected they cannot bring in suggestions which will result in savings of less than 2 percent. What does 2 percent mean in terms that you and I can understand? This little 2 percent is 13 times the amount of money which the Federal Government is now spending in aid to hospital construction. It is more than 3 times the cost estimate of the original Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill for low-cost public housing. It is more than 3 times the amount proposed to be spent under the various proposals for Federal aid to education. This little 2 percent is greater than the total annual expendi-

ture for all flood protection throughout the entire United States.

In the discharge of my responsibility as a Member of this body, my only choice is to vote for the pending bill. Most of my colleagues will, in good conscience, do likewise. The times permit of no other action. Yet economic strength is as vital as military strength to the survival of this country. We face huge military expenditures for an indefinite number of years. Our economy will fall if we are complacent in granting these enormous appropriations. We cannot blindly vote "aye" because it is in the name of defense. We cannot be satisfied with lifting up a corner of the rug and sweeping out a little dust. Each and every spring, we must take the rug out of the house, hang it in the back yard and give it an old-fashioned beating. To do this, we must have an adequate staff responsible to the legislative branch of the Government and to it alone. We are constantly told that a strong defense is our only salvation. I respectfully submit that a strong economy is the basic support of a strong defense and is, therefore, even more vital to our salvation.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SCRIVNER: On page 63, line 10, insert the following:

"SEC. 628. No appropriation contained in this act shall be available for any direct expense (including commercial transportation in the United States to the place of sale but excluding all transportation outside the United States) in connection with the maintenance, conduct, operation, or management of sales commissaries, or commissary stores, of agencies of the Department of Defense, except where reimbursement for such expenses is to be made."

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, what is done here is simply to exclude on page 63 the objectionable language that was in this paragraph in the first place and to which a point of order was raised. As the amendment now reads, there is no objectionable language, and no point of order can be raised against it because it is purely a limitation on the expenditure of funds.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FORD: On page 65, after line 10, insert the following:

"SEC. 630. No part of any money appropriated in this act or included under any contract authority granted in this act shall be used in making payments under any construction contract or any contract for supplies, materials, equipment, or services, exceeding \$10,000 in amount, unless the person to whom such contract is awarded shall have furnished to the United States a performance bond with a surety or sureties satisfactory to the officer awarding such contract and in such amount as he may deem adequate, for the protection of the United States; except that the Secretary of Defense may waive the requirement of a performance bond in the case of any of the contracts referred to in this section if he determines that the waiver of such requirement is in the interest of the national security and defense."

On page 65, line 11, strike out "630" and insert in lieu thereof "631."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

(Mr. FORD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

[Mr. FORD addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman withdraw his amendment?

Mr. FORD. Yes. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. PRIEST] having assumed the chair, Mr. KEOGH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5054) making appropriations for the National Security Council, the National Security Resources Board, and for military functions administered by the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. MAHON. On that, Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 348, nays 2, answered present 1, not voting 81, as follows:

[Roll No. 150]

YEAS—348

Aandahl	Albert	Anderson, Calif.
Abbitt	Allen, Calif.	Andresen,
Adair	Andersen,	August H.
Addonizio	H. Carl	Andrews

Anfuso	Frazier	McCulloch
Angell	Fugate	McGregor
Armstrong	Fulton	McGuire
Aspinall	Furcolo	McKinnon
Auchincloss	Gamble	McMullen
Ayres	Garmatz	McVey
Bailey	Gary	Mack, Wash.
Baker	Gathings	Madden
Bakewell	Gavin	Magee
Barrett	George	Mahon
Bates, Mass.	Golden	Mansfield
Battle	Goodwin	Martin, Iowa
Beamer	Graham	Martin, Mass.
Beckworth	Granahan	Mason
Belcher	Granger	Meador
Bender	Green	Merrrow
Bennett, Fla.	Greenwood	Miller, Md.
Bennett, Mich.	Gregory	Miller, Nebr.
Bentsen	Gross	Miller, N. Y.
Bishop	Gwinn	Mills
Blackney	Hagen	Morano
Blatnik	Hale	Morrison
Boggs, Del.	Hall	Morton
Bolling	Edwin Arthur	Multer
Bolton	Hall	Mumma
Bonner	Leonard W.	Murdock
Bow	Halleck	Murphy
Boykin	Hand	Murray, Tenn.
Bramblett	Harden	Nelson
Bray	Hardy	Nicholson
Brooks	Harris	Norblad
Brown, Ga.	Harrison, Va.	Norrell
Brown, Ohio	Harrison, Wyo.	O'Brien, Ill.
Brownson	Harvey	O'Brien, Mich.
Bryson	Havenner	O'Hara
Buchanan	Hays, Ark.	O'Neill
Budge	Hays, Ohio	Ostertag
Burdick	Heffernan	O'Toole
Burleson	Heller	Patman
Burnside	Herlong	Patterson
Burton	Hertner	Perkins
Bush	Heselton	Philbin
Butler	Hill	Pickett
Byrne, N. Y.	Hoeven	Poage
Byrnes, Wis.	Hoffman, Ill.	Polk
Camp	Hoffman, Mich.	Potter
Canfield	Hollfield	Powell
Cannon	Holmes	Preston
Carlyle	Hope	Price
Carnahan	Horan	Priest
Case	Howell	Prouty
Celler	Hull	Rabaut
Chenoweth	Hunter	Radwan
Chiperfield	Irving	Rains
Chudoff	Jackson, Calif.	Ramsay
Church	Jackson, Wash.	Reams
Clemente	James	Redden
Clevenger	Jarman	Reece, Tenn.
Cole, Kans.	Javits	Reed, Ill.
Cole, N. Y.	Jenison	Reed, N. Y.
Combs	Jenkins	Rees, Kans.
Cooley	Jensen	Regan
Cooper	Jonas	Rhodes
Corbett	Jones, Ala.	Ribicoff
Cotton	Jones, Mo.	Richards
Coudert	Jones,	Riehlman
Cox	Hamilton C.	Riley
Crawford	Jones,	Rivers
Crosser	Woodrow W.	Roberts
Crumpacker	Judd	Robeson
Cunningham	Karsten, Mo.	Rodino
Curtis, Mo.	Kearney	Rogers, Colo.
Curtis, Nebr.	Kearns	Rogers, Mass.
Davis, Ga.	Keating	Rogers, Tex.
Davis, Tenn.	Kee	Rooney
Davis, Wis.	Kelley, Pa.	Roosevelt
Dawson	Kelly, N. Y.	Sadlak
Deane	Keogh	St. George
DeGraffenried	Kerr	Sasser
Denny	Kersten, Wis.	Schwabe
Denton	Kilburn	Scott, Hardie
Devereux	Kilday	Scrivner
D'Ewart	King	Secrest
Dolliver	Kirwan	Seely-Brown
Dondero	Klein	Shafer
Donohue	Kluczynski	Sheehan
Donovan	Lane	Sheppard
Doughton	Lanham	Sieminski
Doyle	Lantaff	Sikes
Elliott	Larcade	Simpson, Ill.
Evins	Latham	Simpson, Pa.
Feighan	LeCompte	Sittler
Fellows	Lesinski	Smith, Miss.
Fenton	Lind	Smith, Va.
Fernandez	Lovre	Smith, Wis.
Fisher	Lyle	Spence
Flood	McCarthy	Springer
Forand	McConnell	Stanley
Ford	McCormack	Steed
Forrester		

Stefan	Trimble
Stigler	Vall
Stockman	Van Pelt
Sutton	Van Zandt
Taber	Vaughn
Tackett	Velde
Talle	Vinson
Teague	Vorvys
Thomas	Vursell
Thompson,	Walter
Mich.	Watts
Thompson, Tex.	Weichel
Thornberry	Wharton
Tollefson	Wickersham
Towe	Widnall

NAYS—2

Buffett Marshall

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Phillips

NOT VOTING—81

Abernethy	Ellsworth	Murray, Wis.
Allen, Ill.	Elston	O'Konski
Allen, La.	Engle	Passman
Arends	Fallon	Patten
Barden	Fine	Poulson
Baring	Fogarty	Quinn
Bates, Ky.	Gordon	Rankin
Beall	Gore	Sabath
Berry	Grant	Saylor
Betts	Hart	Scott,
Boggs, La.	Hebert	Hugh D., Jr.
Bosone	Hedrick	Scudder
Breen	Hess	Shelley
Brehm	Hillings	Short
Buckley	Hinshaw	Smith, Kans.
Busbey	Johnson	Staggers
Chatham	Kennedy	Taylor
Chelf	Lucas	Welch
Colmer	McDonough	Werdell
Dague	McGrath	Wheeler
Delaney	McMillan	Whitaker
Dempsey	Machrowicz	Whitten
Dingell	Mack, Ill.	Wolcott
Dollinger	Miller, Calif.	Wood, Ga.
Dorn	Mitchell	Woodruff
Durham	Morgan	Yorty
Eaton	Morris	
Eberharter	Moulder	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Dollinger with Mr. Eaton.
 Mr. Hedrick with Mr. Hess.
 Mr. Fine with Mr. Elston.
 Mr. Morgan with Mr. Betts.
 Mr. Welch with Mr. Short.
 Mr. Hart with Mr. Allen of Illinois.
 Mr. Mitchell with Mr. Beall.
 Mr. Patten with Mr. Hillings.
 Mr. Whitaker with Mr. Taylor.
 Mr. Rankin with Mr. Arends.
 Mr. Delaney with Mr. Werdell.
 Mr. Staggers with Mr. Wolcott.
 Mr. Shelley with Mr. Dague.
 Mr. Bates of Kentucky with Mr. McDonough.
 Mr. Baring with Mr. Saylor.
 Mr. Wood of Georgia with Mr. Scudder.
 Mrs. Bosone with Mr. Ellsworth.
 Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Hinshaw.
 Mr. Lucas with Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr.
 Mr. Boggs of Louisiana with Mr. Busbey.
 Mr. Machrowicz with Mr. Smith of Kansas.
 Mr. Dingell with Mr. Woodruff.
 Mr. Engle with Mr. Poulson.
 Mr. Buckley with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin.
 Mr. Quinn with Mr. Berry.
 Mr. McGrath with Mr. Johnson.
 Mr. Chatham with Mr. O'Konski.
 Mr. Chelf with Mr. Brehm.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF THE COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication which was read:

AUGUST 9, 1951.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
The Speaker,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby submit my resignation from the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, effective immediately.

Respectfully,

HAROLD D. DONOHUE.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication which was read:

AUGUST 9, 1951.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the House Committee on Public Works, effective immediately, because of my impending election to the House Committee on the Judiciary.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

TOM PICKETT.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF THE COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

AUGUST 9, 1951.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby submit my resignation as a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, effective immediately.

Very sincerely yours,

WAYNE L. HAYS.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 376) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That ELIZABETH KEE, of West Virginia, and VERA BUCHANAN, of Pennsylvania, be, and they are hereby, elected members of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on Veterans' Affairs.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTION OF MEMBER TO COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 377) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, that WAYNE L. HAYS, of Ohio, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on Banking and Currency.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I offer another resolution (H. Res. 378) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That TOM PICKETT, of Texas, and HAROLD D. DONOHUE, of Massachusetts, be, and they are hereby, elected members of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on the Judiciary.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO PRINT

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken on the defense bill today may be permitted to revise and extend their remarks, and that all other Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks, and that in connection with my remarks made in committee I may include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Landers, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3292) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and funds available for the Export-Import Bank of Washington for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House of Representatives to Senate amendment No. 13 to the above-entitled bill.

THE OATIS RESOLUTION

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further consideration of the Oatis resolution be postponed, and that it may be in order at any time in the future for the House, as in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, to bring up the resolution for further consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understood it would be called up next Tuesday.

Mr. McCORMACK. I wanted to get the blanket authority first, and then confine it to a date.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. What about Tuesday?

Mr. McCORMACK. I desire to announce now that it is the intention to

bring up the further consideration of the resolution on Tuesday next.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I wonder if the gentleman could tell us whether or not it would be in order to make the Oatis resolution and the pending amendment the first order of business on Tuesday?

Mr. McCORMACK. I wish the gentleman would not ask me to commit myself now. I will say this, that it is my intention, without committing myself that it be the first order of business, to bring it up on Tuesday, but I prefer not to be bound in case something else might develop.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I thank the gentleman. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, how will that affect the parliamentary situation with respect to the Oatis resolution?

Mr. McCORMACK. My unanimous-consent request was for a continuation of the consideration of the resolution.

Mr. GROSS. To be considered in the House?

Mr. McCORMACK. To be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, how will this affect William Oatis?

Mr. McCORMACK. So far as the gentleman from Massachusetts is concerned, he did everything he could for Mr. Oatis. The first day it was reported out I made arrangements to bring it up, if you want to go into that.

Mr. BENDER. Yes, I would like to get into that.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Massachusetts did not ask for a rule from the Committee on Rules. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] as well as members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, conferred, and we made arrangements to bring it up the very day it was reported, which is most unusual. Now I will say to my friend from Ohio, so far as the leadership on both sides is concerned, we have done everything we could to bring it up promptly. The bill came up in the House as in Committee of the Whole. If I had been in the House at the time I would not have permitted it. My understanding was that it was going to be called up by unanimous consent, but I happened to be in conference, and when I came back I found the House was sitting in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Then the amendment was offered, and we know the situation that developed, and in good faith, and then a unanimous request was made to put it over until today. Now we find that the consideration of the defense appropriation bill has run rather late in the afternoon, and now we have this situation. I then made the unanimous-consent request not for a certain date, but to bring it up at any time. But then I had an agreement for next Tuesday and I am putting it down for next Tuesday. Nobody can make any complaint about that.

82^D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 5054

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

AUGUST 10 (legislative day, AUGUST 1), 1951

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations

AN ACT

Making appropriations for the National Security Council, the National Security Resources Board, and for military functions administered by the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money
4 in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the National
5 Security Council, the National Security Resources Board,
6 and for military functions administered by the Department
7 of Defense, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending
8 June 30, 1952, namely:

TITLE I

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the National Security Council, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates not in excess of \$50 per diem for individuals; acceptance and utilization of voluntary and uncompensated services; and expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with work related to the activity of the Council; \$160,000.

NATIONAL SECURITY RESOURCES BOARD

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the National Security Resources Board; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates for individuals not in excess of \$50 per diem and contracts with temporary or part-time employees may be renewed annually; expenses of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the work of the National Security Resources Board; hire of passenger motor vehicles; reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services for protection of confidential files; not to exceed \$8,000 for newspapers and periodicals; and not to exceed \$10,000 for emergency and extraordinary expenses, to be expended under the direction of the Chairman

1 for such purposes as he deems proper, and his determination
2 thereon shall be final and conclusive; \$1,600,000.

3 DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

4 MILITARY FUNCTIONS

5 TITLE II

6 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

7 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

8 For expenses necessary for the Office of the Secretary
9 of Defense, the Armed Forces Policy Council, the Joint
10 Chiefs of Staff and the Joint Staff, the Munitions Board, and
11 the Research and Development Board, including purchase
12 (not to exceed five for replacement only, including one at not
13 to exceed \$4,500) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; and
14 not to exceed \$60,000 for emergency and extraordinary ex-
15 penses, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of
16 Defense for such purposes as he deems proper, and his deter-
17 mination thereon shall be final and conclusive; \$13,800,000.

18 CLAIMS

19 For payment of claims by the Office of the Secretary
20 of Defense, the Army (except as provided in appropriations
21 for civil functions administered by the Department of the
22 Army), Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force, as authorized
23 by law (5 U. S. C. 946; 28 U. S. C. 2672; 31 U. S. C.
24 222c, 222e, 223b, 223d, 224d; 34 U. S. C. 600; 35 U. S. C.

1 91; 39 U. S. C. 135; 46 U. S. C. 797; Act of November
2 15, 1945, 59 Stat. 582) ; claims (not to exceed \$1,000
3 in any one case) for damages to or loss of private property
4 incident to the operation of Army and Air National Guard
5 camps of instruction, either during the stay of units of said
6 organizations at such camps or while en route thereto or
7 therefrom; claims, as authorized by law, for damage to
8 property of railroads under training contracts; and repay-
9 ment of amounts determined by the Secretary of the Army,
10 the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air
11 Force, or officers designated by them, to have been erro-
12 neously collected from military and civilian personnel of the
13 Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force or from
14 States, Territories, or the District of Columbia, or members
15 of National Guard units thereof; \$5,000,000.

16

RETIRED PAY

17 For retired pay and retirement pay, as authorized by law,
18 of military personnel on the retired lists of the Army, Navy,
19 Marine Corps, and the Air Force, including the reserve
20 components thereof; and retainer pay for personnel of the
21 inactive Fleet Reserve; \$345,000,000: *Provided*, That no
22 part of such sum shall be used to pay the retired or retire-
23 ment pay of any member of the Regular Army, Navy, Marine

1 Corps, or Air Force who is retired after the date of enact-
2 ment of this Act, unless such member was retired because
3 of (1) being unfit to perform the duties of his office, rank,
4 grade, or rating by reason of a physical disability incurred
5 in line of duty, or (2) achieving the age at which retirement
6 is required by law.

7 CONTINGENCIES

8 For emergencies and extraordinary expenses arising in
9 the Department of Defense, to be expended on the approval
10 or authority of the Secretary of Defense and such expenses
11 may be accounted for solely on his certificate that the ex-
12 penditures were necessary for confidential military purposes,
13 \$75,000,000: *Provided*, That a report of disbursements
14 under this item of appropriation shall be made quarterly
15 to the Appropriation Committees of the Congress.

16 EMERGENCY FUND

17 For transfer by the Secretary of Defense, with the ap-
18 proval of the Bureau of the Budget, to any appropriation
19 for military functions under the Department of Defense
20 available for research and development, to be merged with
21 and to be available for the same purposes, and for the same
22 time period, as the appropriation to which transferred,
23 \$90,000,000.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

TITLE III

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF THE ARMY

CONTINGENCIES OF THE ARMY

For emergencies and military expenses arising in the Department of the Army or any of its subordinate bureaus or offices in the District of Columbia, or in the Army at large, but impossible to be anticipated or classified, including personal services; the actual and necessary expenses or per diem in lieu thereof, as may be determined and approved by the Secretary of the Army, of military and civilian personnel in and under the Department of the Army on special duty in foreign countries; to be expended on the approval or authority of the Secretary of the Army, and for such purposes as he may deem proper, and his determination thereon shall be final and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the Government and payments from this appropriation may, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Army, be made on his certificate that the expenditures were necessary for confidential military purposes; \$88,000,000.

CIVILIAN RELIEF IN KOREA

For an additional amount for "Civilian relief in Korea," \$50,000,000.

EXPEDITING PRODUCTION

To enable the Secretary of the Army, without reference to section 3734 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and to section 1136 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (except provisions thereof relating to title approval), to expedite the production of equipment and supplies for the Army for emergency national defense purposes, including all of the objects and purposes specified under each of the appropriations available to the Department of the Army during the current fiscal year, for procurement or production of equipment or supplies, for erection of structures, or for acquisition of land; the furnishing of Government-owned facilities at privately owned plants; the procurement and training of civilian personnel in connection with the production of equipment and material and the use and operation thereof, \$1,000,000,000.

NATIONAL BOARD FOR PROMOTION OF RIFLE PRACTICE,
ARMY

For necessary expenses of construction, equipment, and maintenance of rifle ranges, the instruction of citizens in marksmanship, and promotion of rifle practice, in accordance with the Act of August 29, 1916 (39 Stat. 643), and the provisions of law contained in 10 U. S. C. 1184-1185 and 32 U. S. C. 181-186, including travel of rifle

1 teams, military personnel and individuals attending regional,
 2 national, and international competitions, and not to exceed
 3 \$18,000 for incidental expenses of the National Board,
 4 \$130,000: *Provided*, That travel expenses of civilian mem-
 5 bers of the National Board shall be paid in accordance with
 6 the Standardized Government Travel Regulations, as
 7 amended.

8 GENERAL STAFF

9 FIELD EXERCISES

10 For expenses, not otherwise provided for, required for
 11 the conduct of special field exercises, including participation
 12 therein by the National Guard and the Organized Reserves,
 13 and including personal services of temporary employees,
 14 expenses of troop movements and temporary duty travel of
 15 military and civilian personnel, in connection with special
 16 field exercises, including special combat training for small
 17 units, movement of matériel, maintenance and operation of
 18 structures and utilities, rental of land or purchase of options
 19 to rent land without reference to section 3648, Revised
 20 Statutes, and for use or repair of private property,
 21 \$16,000,000.

22 INTER-AMERICAN RELATIONS, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

23 For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary of the
 24 Army to adopt such measures, appropriate to the functions
 25 and activities of the Department of the Army, as he may

1 deem advisable, to promote better relations with the other
 2 American countries, including transportation and subsistence
 3 expenses, while traveling in the Western Hemisphere, of
 4 Army officers and military students of the other American
 5 countries and Army officers of the United States, \$388,000.

6 FINANCE CORPS

7 FINANCE SERVICE, ARMY

8 For Finance Service, Army, to be accounted for as one
 9 fund, as follows—

10 PAY OF THE ARMY.

11 For pay and allowances (except commuted rations for
 12 enlisted personnel) of cadets and all other personnel of the
 13 Army of the United States on active duty (other than
 14 personnel of the Reserve components, including the National
 15 Guard, on active duty while undergoing Reserve training);
 16 pay of civilian employees at military headquarters; interest
 17 on soldiers' deposits; payment of life insurance premiums
 18 authorized by law; mustering-out payments, as authorized by
 19 the "Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944", as amended
 20 (38 U. S. C. 691-691g), to persons who were or may be
 21 denied such payments because they were discharged from
 22 the Army to enter the United States Military Academy or
 23 the United States Naval Academy and subsequently were
 24 discharged from either Academy because of physical dis-

1 ability; expenses of military courts, boards and commissions;
2 expenses of apprehension and delivery of deserters, escaped
3 military prisoners, and soldiers absent without leave, in-
4 cluding payment of rewards, in the discretion of the Secre-
5 tary of the Army, not exceeding \$25 in any one case, to
6 civil officers and citizens, costs of confinement of military
7 prisoners in nonmilitary facilities, donations of not to exceed
8 \$25 to each civilian prisoner upon each release from an Army
9 prison and each soldier discharged otherwise than honorably
10 upon each release from confinement under court-martial sen-
11 tence, and donations of not to exceed \$10, as authorized by
12 law, to each person discharged for fraudulent enlistment;
13 \$3,297,076,000: *Provided*, That section 212 of the Act of
14 June 30, 1932 (5 U. S. C. 59a), shall not apply to retired
15 military personnel on duty at the United States Soldiers'
16 Home: *Provided further*, That the duties of librarian at the
17 United States Military Academy may be performed by an
18 officer of the Regular Army retired from active service, and
19 detailed on active duty for that purpose;

20 TRAVEL OF THE ARMY

21 For travel allowances and travel in kind, as authorized
22 by law, for persons traveling in connection with the military
23 activities of the Department of the Army, including rental
24 of camp sites and the local procurement of communication
25 service, fuel, light, water service, and other necessary

1 supplies and services incident to individual or troop move-
2 ments, including transportation of organizational equipment
3 and impedimenta; and for expenses, not otherwise provided
4 for, incident to the transportation of authorized baggage of
5 military and civilian personnel; \$245,000,000: *Provided*,
6 That other appropriations for the Department of the Army
7 shall be charged with such amounts as may be required for
8 travel in connection with development, procurement, produc-
9 tion, maintenance, or construction activities; and, with such
10 exception, no other Army appropriation in this Act shall be
11 available for any expense for or incident to travel of personnel
12 of the Regular Army or civilian employees under the Depart-
13 ment of the Army, except the appropriation "Contingencies
14 of the Army" and the appropriations for Engineer Service,
15 Army, the Army National Guard, the Organized Reserves,
16 the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, the National Board for
17 the Promotion of Rifle Practice, and the appropriations
18 "Special Field Exercises", and "Inter-American Relations,
19 Department of the Army";

20 FINANCE SERVICE

21 For compensation of field personnel of the Finance
22 Corps, and services incident to financial management activi-
23 ties not otherwise provided for; payment of exchange fees
24 and exchange losses incurred by disbursing officers or their
25 agents; and losses in the accounts of Army disbursing officers

1 in accordance with the Acts of December 13, 1944 (31
2 U. S. C. 95a), December 23, 1944 (50 U. S. C. 1705-
3 1707), and July 26, 1947 (61 Stat. 493) ; \$48,423,000.

4 QUARTERMASTER CORPS

5 QUARTERMASTER SERVICE, ARMY

6 For Quartermaster Service, Army, to be accounted for
7 as one fund, as follows—

8 WELFARE OF ENLISTED MEN

9 For the equipment and conduct of school, reading, lunch,
10 and amusement rooms, service clubs, chapels, gymnasiums,
11 and libraries, including periodicals and other publications
12 and subscriptions for newspapers, transportation of books
13 and equipment for these services, rental of films, purchase
14 of slides for and making repairs to moving-picture outfits,
15 and for similar and other recreational purposes at training
16 and mobilization camps now established or which may be
17 hereafter established, including expenses for the entertain-
18 ment and instruction of enlisted personnel, \$20,000,000:
19 *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for the
20 instruction of officers on the same basis as enlisted men.

21 SUBSISTENCE OF THE ARMY

22 For purchase of subsistence supplies for issue as rations
23 to troops, including retired enlisted men when ordered to
24 active duty, civil employees when entitled thereto, hospital
25 matrons, applicants for enlistment while held under obser-

1 vation, general prisoners of war, and general prisoners at
2 posts; ice for issue to organizations of enlisted men and for
3 cooling drinking water and for preservation of stores; sub-
4 sistence of the masters, officers, crews, and employees of Army
5 vessels; meals for recruiting parties and applicants for enlist-
6 ment while under observation; sales to officers, including mem-
7 bers of the Officers' Reserve Corps while on active duty, and
8 enlisted men of the Army; payment of allowances of commu-
9 tation in lieu of rations to enlisted men as authorized by law;
10 commuted rations for enlisted men, applicants for enlistment
11 while held under observation, civilian employees who are
12 entitled to subsistence at public expense, and general
13 prisoners while sick in hospitals, to be paid to the surgeon in
14 charge; advertising; for subsistence of supernumeraries ne-
15 cessitated by emergent military circumstances; prizes to be
16 established by the Secretary of the Army for enlisted men
17 of the Army who graduate from the Army schools for bakers
18 and cooks; and for other necessary expenses incident to the
19 purchase, testing, care, preservation, issue, sale, and
20 accounting for subsistence supplies for the Army; in all,
21 \$603,309,000: *Provided*, That none of the funds appro-
22 priated in this title shall be used for the payment of
23 any subsidy on agricultural or other products: *Provided*
24 *further*, That no part of this or any other appropriation con-
25 tained in this Act shall be available for the procurement

1 of any article of food or clothing not grown or produced in
2 the United States or its possessions, except to the extent
3 that the Secretary of the Department concerned shall deter-
4 mine that a satisfactory quality and sufficient quantity of any
5 articles of food or clothing grown or produced in the United
6 States or its possessions cannot be procured as and when
7 needed at United States market prices and except procure-
8 ments by vessels in foreign waters and emergency procure-
9 ments or procurements of perishable foods by establishments
10 located outside the continental United States, except the
11 Territories of Hawaii and Alaska, for the personnel attached
12 thereto: *Provided further*, That nothing herein shall preclude
13 the procurement of foods manufactured or processed in the
14 United States or its possessions;

15 REGULAR SUPPLIES OF THE ARMY

16 For supplies, services, and other expenses, not otherwise
17 provided for, incident to the design, development, procure-
18 ment, manufacture, care, protection, alteration, repair, main-
19 tenance, installation, storage and issue of Quartermaster
20 Corps supplies, materials, and equipment (exclusive of fixed
21 installations in buildings otherwise provided for), including
22 petroleum and other products, market reports and personal
23 services; supplies and equipment for troops and general serv-
24 ice schools; operation of field printing plants not otherwise
25 provided for and contract printing and binding; purchase,

1 subsistence, and care of animals required in connection with
2 Army training and other activities; expenses incident to
3 raising and harvesting forage on military reservations, in-
4 cluding, when specifically authorized by the Secretary of
5 the Army, the cost of irrigation; \$465,000,000;

6 CLOTHING AND EQUIPAGE

7 For cloth, woolens, materials, and for the purchase and
8 manufacture of clothing for the Army, including retired
9 enlisted men when ordered to active duty, for issue and for
10 sale; commutation of clothing due enlisted men; altering and
11 fitting clothing and washing and cleaning when necessary,
12 including laundry work for enlisted men while patients in a
13 hospital; operation of laundries, existing or now under con-
14 struction, including purchase and repair of laundry machinery
15 therefor; authorized issues of articles for use of general
16 prisoners confined at military posts without pay or allow-
17 ances, and for applicants for enlistment while held under
18 observation; equipment and repair of equipment of existing
19 dry-cleaning plants, salvage and sorting storehouses, hat-
20 repairing shops, shoe-repair shops, clothing-repair shops,
21 and garbage-reduction works; equipage; issue of toilet kits
22 to recruits upon their first enlistment; expenses of packing
23 and handling and similar necessities; citizens' outer clothing
24 and an overcoat, when necessary, the cost of all not to
25 exceed \$30, to be issued each person upon each release

1 from an Army prison, each soldier discharged otherwise
2 than honorably, to each enlisted man convicted by civil
3 court for an offense resulting in confinement in a penitentiary
4 or other civil prison, and to each enlisted man ordered
5 interned as an alien enemy, or, for the same reason, dis-
6 charged without internment; \$1,506,681,000: *Provided*,
7 That none of the funds appropriated in this or any other
8 Act, and none of the property procured therewith, shall
9 be available for transfer to any working capital fund under
10 the provisions of section 405 (d) of the National Security
11 Act, as amended.

12 INCIDENTAL EXPENSES OF THE ARMY

13 Postage; incidental expenses of recruiting; for activi-
14 ties of chaplains (excluding ritual garments and personal
15 services); for tests and experimental and development
16 work and scientific research, not otherwise provided for,
17 including that to be performed by the Bureau of Standards
18 for the Quartermaster Corps; for inspection service and
19 instruction furnished by the Department of Agriculture
20 which may be transferred in advance; for such additional
21 expenditures as are necessary and authorized by law in the
22 movements and operation of the Army and at military posts,
23 and not expressly assigned to any other departments; for
24 burial of the dead as authorized by Acts of May 17, 1938
25 (10 U. S. C. 916-916d), and July 8, 1940 (5 U. S. C.

1 103a), including remains of personnel of the Army of the
 2 United States who die while on active duty, including travel
 3 allowances of attendants accompanying remains, communi-
 4 cation service, transportation of remains, and acquisition by
 5 lease or otherwise of temporary burial sites; \$187,914,000.

6 TRANSPORTATION CORPS

7 TRANSPORTATION SERVICE, ARMY

8 For expenses necessary for the transportation of Army
 9 supplies, equipment, funds of the Army, including packing,
 10 crating, and unpacking; maintenance and operation of trans-
 11 portation facilities and installations, including the purchase,
 12 construction, alteration, operation, lease, repair, development,
 13 and maintenance of and research in transportation equipment,
 14 including boats, vessels, and railroad equipment; procure-
 15 ment of supplies and equipment; communication service;
 16 maps, wharfage, tolls, ferriage, drayage, and cartage;
 17 conducting instruction in Army transportation activities;
 18 \$968,515,000: *Provided*, That during the current
 19 fiscal year the cost of transportation from point of
 20 origin to the first point of storage or consumption
 21 of supplies, equipment, and material in connection with the
 22 manufacturing and purchasing activities of the Quartermaster
 23 Corps may be charged to the appropriations from which
 24 such supplies, equipment, and material are procured: *Pro-*

1 *vided further*, That vessels under the jurisdiction of the
2 Department of Commerce, the Department of the Army,
3 the Department of the Air Force, or the Department of
4 the Navy may be transferred or otherwise made available
5 without reimbursement to any of such agencies upon the
6 request of the head of one agency and the approval of the
7 agency having jurisdiction of the vessels concerned.

8 SIGNAL CORPS

9 SIGNAL SERVICE OF THE ARMY

10 Purchase, equipment, operation, installation, and repair
11 of military telegraph, telephone, radio, cable, signaling, and
12 aircraft warning systems; signal equipment and stores,
13 heliographs, signal lanterns, flags, and other necessary in-
14 struments; wind vanes, barometers, anemometers, ther-
15 mometers, and other meteorological instruments; photo-
16 graphic and cinematographic work performed for the Army
17 by the Signal Corps; motor-driven and other vehicles for
18 technical and official purposes in connection with the con-
19 struction, operation, and maintenance of communication or
20 signaling systems, and supplies for their operation and main-
21 tenance; maps for use of the Signal Corps and in the office
22 of the Chief Signal Officer; telephone apparatus, including
23 rental and payment for commercial, exchange, message,
24 trunk-line, long-distance, and leased-line telephone service,
25 excepting telephone service for the various bureaus in the

1 District of Columbia, and the rental of commercial telegraph
2 lines and equipment, and their operation, at or connecting
3 any Army facility, including payment for official individual
4 telegraph messages transmitted over commercial lines; elec-
5 trical installations and maintenance thereof, electric time
6 service, fire control and direction apparatus, and matériel
7 for Field Artillery; supplies, general repairs, reserve
8 supplies, and other expenses connected with the col-
9 lection and transmitting of information for the Army
10 by telegraph or otherwise; experimental investigation,
11 research, purchase, and development, or improvements
12 in apparatus, and maintenance of signaling and acces-
13 sories thereto, including machines, instruments, and
14 other equipment for laboratory and repair purposes; lease,
15 alteration, and repair of such buildings required for storing
16 or guarding Signal Corps supplies, equipment, and personnel
17 when not otherwise provided for, including the introduction
18 of water, electric light and power, sewerage, grading, roads
19 and walks, and other equipment required; for all expenses,
20 not otherwise provided for, incident to the preparation of
21 plans, and construction, purchase, installation, equipment,
22 maintenance, repair, and operation of aircraft warning service
23 systems, and their accessories, including purchase of lands
24 and rights-of-way, acquisition of leaseholds and other interests
25 therein, and temporary use thereof; \$1,213,707,000.

ALASKA COMMUNICATION SYSTEM

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

For expenses necessary for the operation, maintenance, and improvement of the Alaska Communication System, including purchase (not to exceed one) and hire of passenger motor vehicles, \$4,176,000, to remain available until the close of the fiscal year 1953, and in addition not to exceed 15 per centum of the current fiscal year receipts of the Alaska Communication System may be merged with and used for the purposes of this appropriation.

CONSTRUCTION

For construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, including buildings, facilities, appurtenances and utilities, at stations of the Alaska Communication System, as authorized by Act of October 27, 1949 (Public Law 414), without regard to sections 1136 and 3734, Revised Statutes, as amended, including hire of passenger motor vehicles; \$1,400,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be available for construction of family quarters at (1) an average cost in excess of \$24,000 for construction, including but not limited to, kitchen range, refrigerator, telephone, architectural and engineering services, and all contingencies; nor at (2) a cost per family unit in excess of \$5,000, for site development and outside utilities, including

1 architectural and engineering services therefor and all con-
2 tingencies.

3 MEDICAL SERVICE

4 MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL DEPARTMENT

5 For the manufacture and purchase of medical and hos-
6 pital supplies for military posts, camps, hospitals, hospital
7 ships and transports, and supplies required for mosquito
8 destruction in and about military posts in the Canal Zone;
9 operation of the Army Medical Library and Museum under
10 the direct supervision of the Surgeon General; purchase of
11 veterinary supplies and hire of veterinary surgeons; expenses
12 of medical supply depots and maintenance of branch depots;
13 medical care and treatment of patients when entitled thereto
14 by law, regulation, or contract, including their care, treat-
15 ment, and subsistence in private hospitals, whether on duty
16 or on furlough or on leave of absence except when elective
17 medical treatment has been obtained by such personnel in
18 civilian hospitals or from civilian physicians or dentists; medi-
19 cal care and treatment of authorized personnel of any country
20 whose defense the President deems vital to the defense of
21 the United States when such care and treatment cannot be
22 obtained from medical units of their own country; care and
23 treatment of epidemic and contagious diseases in the Army
24 or at military posts or stations, including measures to prevent
25 the spread thereof; pay of internes; pay of civilian physicians

1 employed to examine physically applicants for enlistment
2 and enlisted men and to render other professional services
3 from time to time under proper authority; payment of ex-
4 press companies and local transfers employed directly by the
5 Medical Service for the transportation of medical and hos-
6 pital supplies, including bidders' samples and water for
7 analysis; supply of Army and Navy Hospital at Hot Springs,
8 Arkansas; advertising, and other necessary miscellaneous
9 expenses of the Medical Service, including tuition and fees
10 of military and civilian personnel at civilian educational
11 institutions; \$269,580,000.

12 CORPS OF ENGINEERS

13 ENGINEER SERVICE, ARMY

14 For expenses necessary for the procurement, manu-
15 facture, maintenance, and issue of utilities, engineer sup-
16 plies, materials, and equipment; procurement, preparation,
17 and reproduction of maps and similar data for military
18 purposes; military surveys, engineering planning, and in-
19 vestigation and design; expenses incident to military and
20 training operations, including operation of the Engineer
21 School; travel and transportation; rentals, at the seat of
22 Government or elsewhere, maintenance, installation, alter-
23 ation, repair, protection, and operation of buildings, grounds,
24 and other facilities, including appurtenances thereto; ad-
25 ministration of real estate, acquisition of lands, easements,

1 rights-of-way, or other similar interests in and tempo-
2 rary use of lands, and, in administering the provisions
3 of 43 U. S. C. 315q, rentals may be paid in advance;
4 payment of deficiency judgments and interest thereon arising
5 out of condemnation proceedings; relocation of utilities not
6 otherwise provided for; utility services for buildings erected
7 at private cost, as authorized by law (10 U. S. C. 1346),
8 and buildings on military reservations authorized by Depart-
9 ment of the Army regulations to be used for a similar pur-
10 pose; and expenses of packing, crating, unpacking, and
11 uncrating of supplies, materials, equipment, and baggage
12 not otherwise provided for; \$1,166,049,000.

13 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY

14 For an additional amount for "Military construction,
15 Army," to remain available until expended, \$48,363,700,
16 for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority
17 heretofore granted under this head to enter into contracts.

18 ORDNANCE CORPS

19 ORDNANCE SERVICE AND SUPPLIES, ARMY

20 For manufacture, procurement, storage, and issue, in-
21 cluding research, planning, design, development, inspection,
22 test, alteration, maintenance, repair, and handling of ordnance
23 material and aircraft, together with the machinery, supplies,
24 and services necessary thereto; supplies and services in con-
25 nection with the general work of the Ordnance Corps, com-

1 prising police and office duties, rents, tolls, fuel, light, water,
2 advertising, stationery, typewriting and computing machines,
3 including their exchange, and furniture, tools, and instru-
4 ments of service; instruction, training, and other incidental
5 expenses of the ordnance service; purchase and hire of
6 passenger motor vehicles; ammunition for military salutes
7 at Government establishments and institutions to which the
8 issues of arms for salutes are authorized; services, material,
9 tools, and appliances for operation of the testing machines
10 and chemical laboratory in connection therewith; publica-
11 tions for libraries of the Ordnance Corps, including the
12 Ordnance Office; \$8,307,500,000.

13 CHEMICAL CORPS

14 CHEMICAL SERVICE, ARMY

15 For purchase, manufacture, and test of chemical agents
16 and toxic substances, incendiary materials and munitions,
17 gas masks, or other offensive or defensive materials or appli-
18 ances required for chemical purposes, investigations, research,
19 design, experimentation, and operation, purchase of chemi-
20 cals, special scientific and technical apparatus and instru-
21 ments, including services connected therewith; maintenance
22 and repair of plants, buildings, and equipment, and the
23 machinery therefor; receiving, storing, and issuing of sup-
24 plies, comprising police and office duties, rents, tolls, fuels,
25 gasoline, lubricants, paints and oils, rope and cordage, light,

1 water, advertising, stationery, typewriting and computing
2 machines including their exchange, office furniture, tools, and
3 instruments; incidental expenses; libraries of the Chemical
4 Corps; expenses incidental to the organization, training, and
5 equipment of special gas troops not otherwise provided for,
6 including the training of the Army in Chemical Corps activi-
7 ties, both offensive and defensive, together with the necessary
8 schools, tactical demonstrations, and maneuvers; expenses
9 of chemical projectile filling plants and proving grounds, in-
10 cluding maintenance of rail transportation, repairs, altera-
11 tions, accessories, building and repairing butts and targets,
12 clearing and grading ranges; \$122,560,000.

13 ARMY TRAINING

14 For miscellaneous supplies, material, equipment, and
15 services, tuition and other incidental expenses, not
16 otherwise provided for, essential in conducting instruc-
17 tion in service schools and elsewhere; contingencies
18 for the Commandant of the National War College, to be
19 expended in his discretion (not exceeding \$1,000); pur-
20 chase, repair, and cleaning of uniforms for guards at the
21 National War College; operation of the Office, Chief, Army
22 Field Forces, subordinate commands, installations, and
23 boards, not otherwise provided for, \$22,300,000.

UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION

For text and reference books for instruction; increase and expense of library; office equipment and supplies; stationery, blank books, forms, diplomas for graduates; expense of lectures; apparatus, equipment, supplies, and materials for purpose of instruction and athletics, and maintenance and repair thereof; musical instruments and maintenance of band; care and maintenance of organ; equipment for cadet mess; postage, telephones, and telegrams; freight and expressage; for commutation of rations to the cadet mess for civilians employed and subsisted at cadet mess in the same amount as deducted from each civilian's pay for said rations; expenses, including not to exceed \$95,000 for contingencies, incident to the observance of the Sesquicentennial of the Military Academy; contingencies for Superintendent of the Military Academy (not exceeding \$5,200) and for the Commandant of Cadets (not exceeding \$1,200), to be expended in their respective discretions; expenses of the members of the Board of Visitors (not exceeding \$1,500); contingent fund, to be expended under the direction of the Academic Board (not exceeding \$1,000); improvement, repair, and maintenance of buildings and grounds (including roads, walls, and fences); shooting galleries and ranges; cooking, heating, and lighting apparatus

1 and fixtures and operation and maintenance thereof; maintenance of water, sewer, and plumbing systems; maintenance of
2 and repairs to cadet camp; fire-extinguishing apparatus; machinery and tools and repairs of same; policing buildings and
3 grounds; furniture, refrigerators, and lockers for Government-owned buildings at the Academy and repair and maintenance
4 thereof; fuel for heat, light, and power; and other necessary
5 incidental expenses in the discretion of the superintendent;
6 in all, \$6,305,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$3,750 of
7 this amount shall be available to liquidate the indebtedness
8 of cadets separated from the service for any reason during
9 their first year, who at the time of their separation are in
10 debt to the Treasurer of the United States Military Academy.

14 CIVILIAN COMPONENTS

15 ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

16 For expenses necessary for equipping, maintaining, operating and training the Army National Guard, including
17 expenses of camps, airfields, storage facilities, buildings, structures, rifle ranges, and facilities, the purchase (not
18 to exceed one hundred) and hire of passenger motor vehicles
19 for official use only, and the modification, repair, maintenance
20 and operation of airplanes; transportation of things; personal
21 services in the National Guard Bureau and services of personnel of the Army National Guard employed as civilians
22 (without regard to their military rank) necessary for the
23
24
25

1 equipment, which may be furnished without reimbursement
2 from Army stocks; \$104,810,000 to remain available until
3 June 30, 1953.

4 ARMY RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS

5 For expenses necessary for the operation of the Reserve
6 Officers' Training Corps, as authorized by law, including
7 procurement, maintenance, transportation, and issue of sup-
8 plies and equipment; pay, subsistence, allowances, trans-
9 portation (including mileage), and medical and hospital
10 treatment and related expenses for members of the Reserve
11 Officers' Training Corps as authorized by law; hire of
12 passenger motor vehicles; maintenance and operation of
13 facilities; establishment and maintenance of camps; cleaning
14 and laundering of uniforms and clothing at camps; expenses
15 of temporary duty travel in connection with activities of
16 the Reserve Officers' Training Corps; expenses for institu-
17 tions as authorized by section 1225, Revised Statutes, as
18 amended, and section 55c of the National Defense Act, as
19 amended (34 U. S. C. 1129; 10 U. S. C. 1180, 1181);
20 expenses of modification, issue, maintenance, and use of
21 supplies, materials, and equipment, which may be furnished
22 without reimbursement from Army stocks; to remain avail-
23 able until June 30, 1953, \$27,141,000.

1 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY CIVILIAN COMPONENTS

2 For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation
 3 and conversion of facilities for the training and administration
 4 of the reserve components, including contributions therefor,
 5 as authorized by the Act of September 11, 1950 (64 Stat.
 6 829), without regard to sections 1136 and 3734, Revised
 7 Statutes, as amended, and land and interests therein may be
 8 acquired and construction prosecuted thereon prior to the
 9 approval of title by the Attorney General as required by
 10 section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; hire of
 11 passenger motor vehicles; \$24,000,000, to remain available
 12 until expended.

13 DEPARTMENTAL SALARIES AND EXPENSES

14 SALARIES, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

15 For compensation for personal services in the Depart-
 16 ment of the Army proper, to be accounted for as one fund,
 17 as follows:

18 Office of Secretary of the Army: Secretary of the Army,
 19 Under Secretary of the Army, Assistant Secretaries of the
 20 Army, and other personal services, \$3,625,000.

21 Office of Chief of Staff, \$9,500,000;

22 Adjutant General's Office, \$16,500,000;

23 Office of the Inspector General, \$259,000;

1 Office of the Judge Advocate General, \$700,000;
 2 Office of the Chief of Finance, \$1,540,500;
 3 Office of the Quartermaster General, \$9,625,000;
 4 Office of the Chief of Transportation, \$3,800,000;
 5 Office of the Chief Signal Officer, \$3,750,000;
 6 Office of the Provost Marshal General, \$245,000;
 7 Office of the Surgeon General, \$3,100,000;
 8 Office of Chief of Engineers, \$5,400,000;
 9 Office of Chief of Ordnance, \$6,500,000;
 10 Office of Chief, Chemical Corps, \$1,500,000;
 11 Office of Chief of Chaplains, \$170,000.
 12 CONTINGENT EXPENSES, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
 13 For miscellaneous expenses at the seat of government,
 14 \$30,000,000.

15 DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

16 TITLE IV

17 MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY

18 For pay, allowances, subsistence, interest on deposits,
 19 gratuities, clothing, permanent change of station travel (in-
 20 cluding expenses of temporary duty between permanent duty
 21 stations), and transportation of dependents, as authorized
 22 by law, for regular and reserve personnel on active duty
 23 (except those on active duty while undergoing reserve
 24 training), \$2,456,475,000.

1 MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVAL RESERVE

2 For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities,
3 and travel, as authorized by law, for personnel of the Naval
4 Reserve on active duty while undergoing reserve training,
5 or while performing drills or equivalent duty \$62,718,000.

6 MILITARY PERSONNEL, OFFICER CANDIDATES

7 For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, and
8 travel, as authorized by law, for officer candidates,
9 including midshipmen at the Naval Academy, aviation
10 midshipmen, aviation cadets, regular and contract enrollees
11 in the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and Reserve
12 officer candidates; and retainer pay authorized by the Act of
13 August 13, 1946 (34 U. S. C. 1020h), to remain available
14 until June 30, 1953; \$19,348,000.

15 NAVY PERSONNEL, GENERAL EXPENSES

16 For expenses necessary for general training, education
17 and administration of regular and reserve personnel, includ-
18 ing tuition, cash book allowances of not to exceed \$50 for
19 each Naval Aviation College program student, and other
20 costs incurred at civilian schools, general training aids and
21 devices, procurement of military personnel, and authorized
22 annuity premiums and retirement benefits for civilian mem-
23 bers of teaching staffs; maintenance and operation of Navy

1 training and personnel facilities, including the Naval Acad-
2 emy, Naval Postgraduate School, Naval War College, Naval
3 Home, Navy training schools and facilities, disciplinary
4 barracks, and retraining commands; rent; hire of motor
5 vehicles; not to exceed \$30 per person for civilian clothing,
6 including an overcoat when necessary, for enlisted person-
7 nel discharged otherwise than honorably; welfare and recre-
8 ation; medals and other awards; research and development;
9 and departmental salaries; \$97,570,000.

10 **MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS**

11 For pay, allowances, subsistence, interest on deposits,
12 gratuities, clothing, permanent change of station travel (in-
13 cluding expenses of temporary duty between permanent
14 duty stations), and transportation of dependents, as author-
15 ized by law, for regular and reserve personnel on active duty
16 (except those on active duty while undergoing reserve
17 training), \$565,459,000.

18 **MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS RESERVE**

19 For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities,
20 and travel, as authorized by law, for personnel of the Marine
21 Corps Reserve and the Marine Corps platoon leaders class
22 on active duty while undergoing reserve training, or while
23 performing drills or equivalent duty, \$15,145,000.

MARINE CORPS TROOPS AND FACILITIES

For necessary expenses of troops and facilities of the Marine Corps not otherwise provided for, including maintenance and operation of equipment and facilities, and procurement of military personnel; training and education of regular and reserve personnel, including tuition and other costs incurred at civilian schools; welfare and recreation; not to exceed \$30 per person for civilian clothing, including an overcoat when necessary, for enlisted personnel discharged otherwise than honorably; research and development; procurement and manufacture of ordnance, ammunition, and other military supplies, equipment and clothing; purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles; transportation of things; industrial mobilization; rent; medals, awards, emblems and other insignia; care of the dead; and departmental salaries; \$1,018,120,000.

AIRCRAFT AND FACILITIES

For expenses necessary for maintenance, operation, and modification of aircraft; maintenance, operation, and lease of air stations and facilities, testing laboratories, fleet and other aviation activities; procurement of services, supplies, special clothing, tools, materials, and equipment, including rescue boats; research and development; industrial mobiliza-

1 tion; aerological services, supplies, and equipment for the
2 Navy and Marine Corps; and departmental salaries; \$923,-
3 393,000: *Provided*, That the unexpended balance of the
4 appropriation for "Aviation, Navy, 1949" shall remain
5 available until June 30, 1952, for the liquidation of con-
6 tract obligations incurred thereunder during the fiscal year
7 1949 for aircraft equipment and research and development.

8 CONSTRUCTION OF AIRCRAFT AND RELATED
9 PROCUREMENT

10 For construction, procurement, and modernization of
11 aircraft and equipment, including ordnance, spare parts, and
12 accessories therefor; expansion of public and not to ex-
13 ceed \$100,000,000 for expansion of private plants, includ-
14 ing the land necessary therefor, without regard to section
15 3734, Revised Statutes, as amended, and such land, and
16 interests therein, may be acquired and construction pros-
17 ecuted thereon prior to approval of title by the Attorney
18 General as required by section 355, Revised Statutes, as
19 amended; procurement and installation of equipment in public
20 or private plants; and departmental salaries necessary for
21 the purposes of this appropriation, to remain available until
22 expended, \$4,000,000,000, of which \$450,000,000 is for
23 liquidation of obligations incurred under authority heretofore
24 granted to enter into contracts for the foregoing purposes.

SHIPS AND FACILITIES

For expenses necessary for design, maintenance, operation, and alteration of vessels; maintenance and operation of facilities; procurement of plant equipment, appliances, and machine tools, and installation thereof in public or private plants; procurement of equipment, supplies, special clothing and services, including subsistence and other expenses of civilian crews of vessels; installation, maintenance, and removal of ships' ordnance; lease of facilities and docks: charter and hire of vessels; relief of vessels in distress; maritime salvage services; research and development; industrial mobilization; and departmental salaries; \$1,537,452,000.

CONSTRUCTION OF SHIPS

For an additional amount for "Construction of Ships," to remain available until expended, \$77,353,000, of which \$55,961,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority heretofore granted under this head: *Provided*, That the total of obligations incurred under this head for construction, conversion, or replacement, approved after July 17, 1947, shall not exceed \$1,085,663,000.

SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION

For expenses necessary for the construction, acquisition, or conversion of vessels as authorized by the Act of March 10, 1951 (Public Law 3), or otherwise authorized by law,

1 including plant equipment, appliances, and machine tools,
2 and installation thereof in public or private plants, and de-
3 partmental salaries necessary for the purposes of this appro-
4 priation, \$1,343,297,000, to remain available until expended:
5 *Provided*, That the amount heretofore appropriated under
6 the head "Construction of ships" for the purposes of the Act
7 of March 10, 1951, is hereby transferred to and merged
8 with this appropriation: *Provided further*, That the total
9 of obligations incurred for the foregoing purposes shall not
10 exceed \$1,480,297,000.

11 ORDNANCE AND FACILITIES

12 For expenses necessary for the production and procure-
13 ment of Navy ordnance and ammunition (except ordnance
14 for new aircraft, new ships, and ships authorized for con-
15 version) ; alteration, preservation, and handling of ordnance
16 and ammunition; maintenance of ordnance (except installa-
17 tion, maintenance, and removal of ships' ordnance, and line
18 maintenance of ordnance installed in aircraft) ; maintenance
19 and operation of ordnance facilities; procurement of equip-
20 ment, supplies, special clothing and services; procurement of
21 plant equipment, appliances, and machine tools, and installa-
22 tion thereof in naval or private plants; lease of facilities;
23 research and development; industrial mobilization; and de-
24 partmental salaries; \$1,335,668,000.

ORDNANCE FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION

For an additional amount for "Ordnance for new construction," to remain available until expended, \$52,445,000, for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority heretofore granted under this head.

ORDNANCE FOR SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION

For expenses necessary for the construction and procurement of armor and armament for vessels provided for in the appropriation "Shipbuilding and conversion," including plant equipment, appliances, and machine tools, and installation thereof in public or private plants, and departmental salaries necessary for the purposes of this appropriation, \$431,390,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the total of obligations incurred under this head shall not exceed \$431,390,000.

INCREASE AND REPLACEMENT OF NAVAL VESSELS

CONSTRUCTION AND MACHINERY

For an additional amount for "Construction and machinery", including, during the current fiscal year, personal services in the Bureau of Ships necessary for the purposes of this appropriation, \$45,000,000.

ARMOR, ARMAMENT, AND AMMUNITION

For an additional amount for "Armor, armament, and ammunition," including, during the current fiscal year, per-

1 sonal services in the Bureau of Ordnance necessary for the
2 purposes of this appropriation, \$12,656,000.

3 MEDICAL CARE

4 For expenses necessary for maintenance and operation
5 of naval hospitals, medical centers, clinics, schools, research
6 facilities, the medical supply system, and other medical
7 activities; procurement of ambulances, medical and dental
8 supplies, equipment and services; rent; instruction of medical
9 personnel in naval hospitals, naval medical schools, and
10 civilian schools; research and development; industrial mo-
11 bilization; care of the dead; and departmental salaries;
12 \$135,770,000.

13 CIVIL ENGINEERING

14 For expenses necessary for maintenance and operation
15 of district public works offices, public works centers, advance
16 base depots, construction battalion centers, defense housing
17 projects, other civil engineering facilities, and shore activities
18 not otherwise provided for; procurement of services, supplies
19 and equipment for the foregoing activities; purchase and
20 hire of passenger motor vehicles; research and development;
21 engineering services; industrial mobilization; and depart-
22 mental salaries; \$196,488,000.

23 PUBLIC WORKS

24 For an additional amount for "Public works", to remain
25 available until expended, \$50,414,000, for liquidation of ob-

1 ligations incurred pursuant to authority heretofore granted
2 under this head to enter into contracts.

3 FACILITIES

4 For expenses necessary for acquisition, construction, and
5 installation of production facilities and equipment, and test
6 facilities and equipment (other than those for research and
7 development), including the land necessary therefor, with-
8 out regard to section 3734, Revised Statutes, as amended,
9 and such land, and interests therein, may be acquired and
10 construction prosecuted thereon prior to the approval of title
11 by the Attorney General as required by section 355, Revised
12 Statutes, as amended, such amounts as may be determined by
13 the Secretary of the Navy, and approved by the Secretary of
14 Defense and the Bureau of the Budget, and said amounts
15 shall be derived by transfer from any appropriations avail-
16 able to the Department of the Navy, during the fiscal year
17 1952, for procurement of equipment for installation or use
18 in private plants: *Provided*, That the total amount so trans-
19 ferred shall not exceed \$100,000,000.

20 RESEARCH

21 For conduct and encouragement of research and develop-
22 ment, not otherwise provided for; dissemination of scientific
23 information; administration of patents, trade-marks, and
24 copyrights; maintenance and operation of research and de-
25 velopment facilities; development, installation, and main-

1 tenance of special devices (including specialized housing
2 therefor) ; procurement of supplies, services, and equipment;
3 departmental salaries; and other expenses necessary in carry-
4 ing out the Act of August 1, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 475), to
5 remain available until expended, \$69,698,000.

6 SERVICE-WIDE SUPPLY AND FINANCE

7 For expenses necessary for maintenance and operation
8 of service-wide supply and finance activities, including supply
9 depots and centers, clothing depots, market and purchasing
10 offices, supply demand control points, fleet fueling facilities,
11 overseas air cargo terminals, regional accounting and dis-
12 bursing offices, the material catalog office, the cost inspection
13 service, and other service-wide supply and finance facilities,
14 as designated by the Secretary; procurement of supplies,
15 services, special clothing, and equipment; rent; intra-Navy
16 transportation of things, all transportation of Navy stock
17 fund material, and transportation of household effects; re-
18 search and development; industrial mobilization; losses in
19 exchange and in the accounts of disbursing officers, as au-
20 thorized by law; and departmental salaries; \$485,102,000.

21 NAVY STOCK FUND

22 For additional working capital for the Navy stock fund,
23 established pursuant to the National Security Act Amend-
24 ments of 1949, \$450,000,000.

SERVICE-WIDE OPERATIONS

For expenses necessary for maintenance and operation of the Naval Observatory, the Hydrographic Office, Service-wide Communications, Naval Records Centers, Naval District Headquarters (except training and public works offices), River Commands, and other service-wide operations and functions not otherwise provided for; procurement of supplies, services and equipment for activities financed hereunder; Latin-American cooperation; not to exceed \$42,127,000 for emergencies and extraordinary expenses, as authorized by section 6 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 419c), to be expended on the approval and authority of the Secretary, and his determination shall be final and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the Government; and departmental salaries; \$150,779,000.

OPERATION AND CONSERVATION OF NAVAL PETROLEUM

RESERVES

For expenses necessary for exploration, prospecting, conservation, development, use, and operation of the naval petroleum reserves, as authorized by law, \$11,908,000.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

TITLE V

AIRCRAFT AND RELATED PROCUREMENT

For construction, procurement, and modification of aircraft and equipment, armor and armament, spare parts and

1 accessories therefor; specialized equipment; expansion of
2 public and private plants, Government-owned equipment
3 and installation thereof in such plants, erection of structures,
4 and acquisition of land without regard to section 1136, Re-
5 vised Statutes, as amended, for the foregoing and other pur-
6 poses, and such land, and interests therein, may be acquired
7 and construction prosecuted thereon prior to the approval
8 of title by the Attorney General as required by section
9 355, Revised Statutes, as amended; industrial mobilization,
10 including maintenance of reserve plants and equipment and
11 procurement planning; and other expenses necessary for
12 the foregoing purposes, including rents and transportation
13 of things; to remain available until expended; \$11,215,-
14 800,000, of which \$625,000,000 is for payment of obligations
15 incurred under authority heretofore granted to enter into
16 contracts for the foregoing purposes: *Provided*, That the
17 unexpended balances of the appropriations granted under the
18 head "Air Corps, Army," 1948, and "General expenses,
19 U. S. Air Force," 1949, shall remain available until June
20 30, 1952, for the payment of obligations incurred thereunder
21 prior to July 1, 1948, and July 1, 1949, respectively.

22 MAJOR PROCUREMENT OTHER THAN AIRCRAFT

23 For procurement of supplies, materials, and equipment,
24 and spare parts therefor, not otherwise provided for; elec-
25 tronic and communication equipment; and the purchase of

1 passenger motor vehicles, \$1,750,000,000, to remain avail-
2 able until expended.

3 ACQUISITION AND CONSTRUCTION OF REAL PROPERTY

4 For an additional amount for "Acquisition and construc-
5 tion of real property", to remain available until expended,
6 \$85,000,000, for payment of obligations incurred under
7 authority heretofore granted under this head to enter into
8 contracts.

9 MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION

10 For expenses necessary for the maintenance, operation,
11 and administration of the activities of the Air Force, includ-
12 ing the United States Air Force Reserve and the Air Re-
13 serve Officers' Training Corps; maintenance, operation, and
14 modification of aircraft; transportation of things; rents at the
15 seat of government and elsewhere, and in administering the
16 provisions of 43 U. S. C. 315q payments of rents may be
17 made in advance; repair of facilities; field printing plants;
18 procurement of ambulances; hire of passenger motor vehicles;
19 training and instruction of military and civilian personnel of
20 the Air Force, including tuition and related expenses; pay,
21 allowances and travel expenses of contract surgeons; utility
22 services for buildings erected at private cost as authorized
23 by law (10 U. S. C. 1346), and buildings on military res-
24 ervations authorized by Air Force regulations to be used for
25 welfare and recreational purposes; rental of land or pur-

1 chase of options to rent land without reference to section
2 3648, Revised Statutes, as amended, use or repair of private
3 property, and other necessary expenses of combat maneuvers;
4 organizational clothing and equipage; payment of exchange
5 fees and exchange losses incurred by Air Force disbursing
6 officers or their agents; losses in the accounts of Air Force
7 disbursing officers as authorized by law (31 U. S. C. 95a;
8 50 U. S. C. 1705-1707; Act of July 26, 1947, Public Law
9 248) ; burial of the dead as authorized by law (10 U. S. C.
10 916-916d; 5 U. S. C. 103a) , including remains of person-
11 nel of the Air Force of the United States who die while on
12 active duty, travel allowances of attendants accompanying
13 remains, and acquisition by lease or otherwise of temporary
14 burial sites; conduct of schoolrooms, service clubs, chapels,
15 and other instructional, entertainment, and welfare expenses
16 for enlisted men, not otherwise provided for; expenses for
17 inter-American cooperation as authorized for the Navy by
18 the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 421f) , for Latin-
19 American cooperation; payments of deficiency judgments and
20 interests thereon arising out of condemnation proceedings
21 heretofore instituted; and special services by contract or
22 otherwise; \$3,208,442,000.

23 MILITARY PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS

24 For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, transportation,
25 interest on deposits of enlisted personnel, and travel in kind

1 for cadets and all other personnel of the Air Force of the
2 United States on active duty (other than personnel of the
3 Reserve components, including the Air National Guard,
4 on active duty while undergoing reserve training), in-
5 cluding commutation of quarters, subsistence supplies for
6 issue as rations to enlisted personnel, cloth and materials and
7 clothing for issue and sale, and clothing allowances, as
8 authorized by law; and, in connection with personnel paid
9 from this appropriation, for rental of camp sites and local
10 procurement of utility services and other necessary expenses
11 incident to individual or troop movements (including pack-
12 ing and unpacking and transportation of organizational equip-
13 ment), ice, meals for recruiting parties, monetary allowances
14 for liquid coffee for troops when supplied cooked or travel
15 rations, altering and fitting clothing, and commutation of
16 rations, as authorized by law, to enlisted personnel, including
17 those sick in hospitals (to be paid to the surgeon in charge);
18 transportation, as authorized by law, of dependents, baggage,
19 and household effects of personnel paid from this appropria-
20 tion; rations for civilian employees when entitled thereto, appli-
21 cants for enlistment, prisoners of war, and general prisoners;
22 subsistence supplies for resale, as authorized by law; commu-
23 tation of rations, as authorized by regulations, to applicants
24 for enlistment, civilian employees entitled to subsistence at
25 public expense, and general prisoners, while sick in hospitals

1 (to be paid to the surgeon in charge) ; subsistence of super-
2 numeraries necessitated by emergent military circumstances;
3 issues of toilet articles and barbers' and tailors' material to
4 general prisoners confined at military posts without pay and
5 allowances, applicants for enlistment, and recruits upon first
6 enlistment; civilian clothing and when necessary an overcoat,
7 the cost of all not to exceed \$30, for each person upon each
8 release from a military prison, each enlisted man discharged
9 otherwise than honorably, each enlisted man convicted by a
10 civil court for an offense resulting in confinement in a civil
11 prison, and each enlisted man interned, or discharged with-
12 out internment as an alien enemy; expenses of apprehension
13 and delivery of deserters, stragglers, and escaped military
14 prisoners; payment, in the discretion of the Secretary, of
15 rewards (not to exceed \$25 in any one case) for the appre-
16 hension of deserters; confinement of military prisoners in
17 nonmilitary facilities; donations of not to exceed \$25 to each
18 civilian prisoner upon each release from a military prison, to
19 each enlisted man discharged otherwise than honorably upon
20 each release from confinement under court-martial sentence,
21 and to each person discharged for fraudulent enlistment;
22 expenses of courts, boards, and commissions; welfare; and
23 medals and other awards; \$3,016,700,000.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

For expenses necessary for basic and applied scientific research and development, by contract or otherwise, and transportation of things, to remain available until expended, \$425,000,000.

RESERVE PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, and travel for personnel of the United States Air Force Reserve and the Air Reserve Officers' Training Corps, while on active duty undergoing reserve training or while performing drills or equivalent duty, or undergoing training and instruction; and the procurement and issue of uniforms to institutions necessary for the training of the Air Reserve Officers' Training Corps, as authorized by law, \$17,543,000, to remain available until June 30, 1953.

AIR NATIONAL GUARD

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, transportation (including mileage, actual and necessary expenses, or per diem in lieu thereof), medical and hospital treatment and related expenses, for members of the Air National Guard while undergoing Reserve training or while performing drills or equivalent duty, including officers on duty under section 5, National Defense Act, as authorized by law; travel expenses

1 (other than mileage), on the same basis as authorized by law
2 for Air National Guard personnel on active Federal duty, of
3 Air National Guard commanders while inspecting units in
4 compliance with National Guard regulations when specifically
5 authorized by the Chief, National Guard Bureau; establish-
6 ment, maintenance, operation, repair, and other necessary
7 expenses of facilities for the training and administration of the
8 Air National Guard, including construction of facilities, and
9 additions, extensions, alterations, improvements, and rehabili-
10 tation of existing facilities, as authorized by the Act of
11 September 11, 1950 (Public Law 783); maintenance, oper-
12 ation, and modification of aircraft; transportation of things;
13 purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles; procurement
14 and issue to the Air National Guard of the several
15 States, Territories, and the District of Columbia of
16 supplies, materials, and equipment, as authorized by law;
17 and expenses incident to the maintenance and use of
18 supplies, materials, and equipment, including such as
19 may be furnished from stocks under the control of
20 agencies of the Department of Defense; \$87,900,000:
21 *Provided*, That the number of caretakers authorized
22 to be employed under the provisions of law (32 U. S. C.
23 42) may be such as is deemed necessary by the Secretary of
24 the Air Force.

CONTINGENCIES

For emergencies and military expenses, to be expended on the authority or approval of the Secretary of the Air Force, and such expenses may be accounted for solely on his certificate, \$40,600,000.

TITLE VI—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 601. During the current fiscal year, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the Air Force, Army, and Navy, respectively, if they should deem it advantageous to the national defense, and if in their opinions the existing facilities of the Department of Defense are inadequate, are authorized to procure services in accordance with section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), but at rates for individuals not in excess of \$50 per day, and to pay in connection therewith travel expenses of individuals, including actual transportation and per diem in lieu of subsistence while traveling from their homes or places of business to official duty station and return as may be authorized by law: *Provided*, That such contracts may be renewed annually.

SEC. 602. Section 3648, Revised Statutes, shall not apply, in the case of payments made from appropriations contained in this Act, (1) to payments made in compliance with the laws of foreign countries or their ministerial regulations, (2) to payments for rent in such countries for such

1 periods as may be necessary to accord with local custom,
2 or (3) to payments made for tuition.

3 SEC. 603. During the current fiscal year, provisions of
4 law prohibiting the payment of compensation to, or employ-
5 ment of, any person not a citizen of the United States shall
6 not apply to personnel of the Department of Defense.

7 SEC. 604. (a) No part of any appropriation contained in
8 this Act for "Pay and allowances" of military personnel
9 shall be used for any other purpose.

10 (b) No part of any appropriation contained in this
11 Act for "Pay and allowances" of military personnel shall
12 be expended for the pay or allowances, accruing after No-
13 vember 30, 1951, of any member of the inactive or volunteer
14 reserve who served on active duty for a period of twelve
15 months or more in any branch of the Armed Forces during
16 the period beginning December 7, 1941, and ending Sep-
17 tember 2, 1945, if such member shall have served on active
18 duty for a period of twelve months or more after June 26,
19 1950, unless such member shall have voluntarily consented
20 to remain on active duty.

21 SEC. 605. The appropriations in this Act otherwise
22 available for travel or transportation which are current
23 on date of relief from duty station of personnel travel-
24 ing under orders may be charged with all expenses in
25 connection with such travel including transportation of de-

pendents and household goods, regardless of time of arrival at destination of such personnel.

SEC. 606. Appropriations contained in this Act available for travel shall be available for all expenses incident to attendance at meetings of technical, scientific, professional, or other similar organizations.

SEC. 607. No part of any money appropriated in this Act or included under any contract authority granted in this Act shall be expended for the payment of any commission on any land purchase contract in excess of 2 per centum of the purchase price.

SEC. 608. Such military and naval personnel as may be detailed for duty with agencies not a part of the Department of Defense on a reimbursement basis may be employed in addition to the numbers otherwise authorized and appropriated for.

SEC. 609. No collection or reclamation shall be made by the United States on account of any money paid to assignees, transferees, or allottees, or to others for them, under assignments, transfers, or allotments of pay and allowances made under authority of law where liability might exist with respect to such assignments, transfers, or allotments or the use of such moneys, because of the death of assignors, transferors, or allotters.

SEC. 610. Appropriations contained in this Act shall

1 be available for insurance of official motor vehicles in
2 foreign countries, when required by laws of such countries;
3 payments in advance of expenses determined by the investi-
4 gating officer to be necessary and in accord with local custom
5 for conducting investigations in foreign countries incident to
6 matters relating to the activities of the department concerned;
7 reimbursement of General Services Administration for se-
8 curity guard services for protection of confidential files;
9 examination of estimates of appropriations and Department
10 of Defense activities in the field and the use of such appro-
11 priations for such purpose shall be subject only to regulation
12 by the standing committees concerned; and all necessary
13 expenses, at the seat of government of the United States
14 of America or elsewhere, in connection with (1) instruction
15 and training, including tuition, not otherwise provided for,
16 of civilian employees, and (2) communication and other
17 services and supplies as may be necessary to carry out the
18 purposes of this Act.

19 SEC. 611. The appropriations contained in this Act
20 for the Air Force, Navy, and for the Army, which
21 are available for the procurement or manufacture of
22 supplies, materials, and equipment of special or technical
23 design may be used for the development and procurement of
24 gages, dies, jigs, and other special aids and appliances, pro-
25 duction studies, factory plans, and other production data,

1 including specifications and detailed drawings, and for the
2 purchase of designs, processes and manufacturing data, copy-
3 rights and letters patent, applications therefor, and licenses
4 thereunder pertaining to such supplies, equipment, and
5 materials for which the appropriations are made.

6 SEC. 612. Any appropriation available to the Air
7 Force, Army, or the Navy may, under such regulations as
8 the Secretary concerned may prescribe, be used for expenses
9 incident to the maintenance, pay, and allowances of prisoners
10 of war, other persons in Air Force, Army, or Navy custody
11 whose status is determined by the Secretary concerned to be
12 similar to prisoners of war, and persons detained in such
13 custody pursuant to Presidential proclamation.

14 SEC. 613. During the current fiscal year, without
15 deposit to the credit of the Treasurer of the United States
16 and withdrawal on money requisitions, receipts of public
17 moneys from sales or other sources by officers of the Depart-
18 ment of Defense on disbursing duty and charged in their
19 official accounts, except receipts to be credited to river and
20 harbor and flood-control appropriations, may be used by them
21 as required for current expenditures, all necessary bookkeep-
22 ing adjustments of appropriations, funds, and accounts to be
23 made in the settlement of their disbursing accounts.

24 SEC. 614. The Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of
25 the Air Force, and the Secretary of the Navy are authorized

1 to expend out of the Appropriations in this Act available for
2 construction or maintenance such amounts as may be required
3 for minor construction (except family quarters), extensions
4 to existing structures, and improvements, at facilities of the
5 Department concerned, but the cost of any project authorized
6 under this section which is not otherwise authorized shall not
7 exceed \$50,000, except that the limitation on the cost of any
8 such project which is determined by the Secretary of Defense
9 to be urgently required in the interests of national defense,
10 shall not exceed \$200,000: *Provided*; That the cost limita-
11 tions of this section shall not apply to amounts authorized to
12 be expended for emergency expenses on the approval of the
13 Secretary concerned.

14 SEC. 615. During the current fiscal year, appropriations
15 contained in this Act (except those for liquidation of
16 prior contract authorizations) shall not be obligated for con-
17 struction of family quarters for personnel at a cost per family
18 unit in excess of \$14,040 on housing units for generals;
19 \$12,040 on housing units for majors, lieutenant colonels and
20 colonels, or equivalent; \$11,040 on housing units for second
21 lieutenants, lieutenants, captains, and warrant officers, or
22 equivalent; or \$10,040 on housing units for enlisted per-
23 sonnel, except that when such units are constructed outside
24 the continental United States or in Alaska, the average cost
25 per unit of all such units shall not exceed \$25,850 and

1 in no event shall the individual cost exceed \$35,000.
2 The last proviso of section 3 of the Act of June 12, 1948
3 (Public Law 626), and the last proviso in the next to last
4 paragraph of section 3 of the Act of June 16, 1948 (Public
5 Law 653), shall not be applicable to appropriations made
6 herein or heretofore to carry out such Acts, in cases where
7 the Secretary of the Department concerned determines that
8 the erection of prefabricated family quarters will be more
9 advantageous to the United States than multiple type dwell-
10 ings of conventional construction.

11 SEC. 616. Appropriations for the Air Force and
12 the Army for the current fiscal year shall be available for
13 carrying out the purposes of Executive Order 9112 of March
14 26, 1942; for expenses in connection with the administration
15 of occupied areas; for distribution of trophies and devices as
16 authorized by law; for actual and necessary expenses or per
17 diem in lieu thereof authorized by law; and, except as other-
18 wise authorized by the Act of September 30, 1950 (Public
19 Law 874), for primary and secondary schooling for depend-
20 ents of military and civilian personnel of the Department of
21 Defense residing on military installations or stationed in for-
22 eign countries, when the Secretary of the department
23 concerned finds that schools, if any, available in the locality,
24 are unable to provide adequately for the education of such
25 dependents; and appropriations for the Air Force for the

1 current fiscal year shall be available for expenses of tem-
2 porary duty travel of military personnel and for travel ex-
3 penses of civilians (other than on permanent change of
4 station) traveling in connection with the activities of the
5 Air Force.

6 SEC. 617. Appropriations for the Navy for the current
7 fiscal year shall be available for expenses in connec-
8 tion with the transfer to the United States of foreign vessels,
9 including pay, subsistence, transportation, and repatriation
10 of alien crews; expenses including those heretofore incurred
11 incident to the operation by the Navy of private plants taken
12 over at the direction of the President, and the Secretary of
13 the Navy may designate any naval appropriation to be
14 charged with such expenses, proper adjustment to be made
15 on the basis of final costs between applicable appropriations;
16 payment of rewards, as authorized by law, for information
17 leading to the discovery of missing naval property or the
18 recovery thereof, and except as otherwise authorized by the
19 Act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 874), for con-
20 tributions for the support of schools for dependents of military
21 and civilian personnel of the Department of Defense as
22 authorized by section 13 of the Act of August 2, 1946
23 (5 U. S. C. 421d).

24 SEC. 618. No part of any appropriation contained
25 in this Act shall be used directly or indirectly except for

1 temporary employment in case of emergency, for the
2 payment of any civilian for services rendered by him on
3 the Canal Zone while occupying a skilled, technical, clerical,
4 administrative, executive, or supervisory position unless such
5 person is a citizen of the United States of America or of the
6 Republic of Panama: *Provided, however*, (1) That, notwith-
7 standing the provision in the Act approved August 11, 1939
8 (53 Stat. 1409), limiting employment in the above-men-
9 tioned positions to citizens of the United States from and
10 after the date of approval of said Act, citizens of Panama
11 may be employed in such positions; (2) that at no time shall
12 the number of Panamanian citizens employed in the above-
13 mentioned positions exceed the number of citizens of the
14 United States so employed, if United States citizens are avail-
15 able in continental United States or on the Canal Zone; (3)
16 that nothing in this Act shall prohibit the continued em-
17 ployment of any person who shall have rendered fifteen
18 or more years of faithful and honorable service on the Canal
19 Zone; (4) that in the selection of personnel for skilled,
20 technical, administrative, clerical, supervisory, or executive
21 positions, the controlling factors in filling these positions shall
22 be efficiency, experience, training, and education; (5) that
23 all citizens of Panama and the United States rendering skilled,
24 technical, clerical, administrative, executive, or supervisory
25 service on the Canal Zone under the terms of this Act

1 (a) shall normally be employed not more than forty hours
2 per week, (b) may receive as compensation equal rates of
3 pay based upon rates paid for similar employment in con-
4 tinental United States plus 25 per centum; (6) this entire
5 section shall apply only to persons employed in skilled, tech-
6 nical, clerical, administrative, executive, or supervisory posi-
7 tions on the Canal Zone directly or indirectly by any branch
8 of the United States Government or by any corporation or
9 company whose stock is owned wholly or in part by the
10 United States Government: *Provided further*, That the
11 President may suspend from time to time in whole or in part
12 compliance with this section if he should deem such course
13 to be in the public interest.

14 SEC. 619. Insofar as practicable, the Secretary of
15 Defense shall assist American small business to participate
16 equitably in the furnishing of commodities and services
17 financed with funds appropriated under this Act by mak-
18 ing available or causing to be made available to suppliers
19 in the United States, and particularly to small independent
20 enterprises, information, as far in advance as possible, with
21 respect to purchases proposed to be financed with funds
22 appropriated under this Act, and by making available or
23 causing to be made available to purchasing and contracting
24 agencies of the Department of Defense information as to

1 commodities and services produced and furnished by small
2 independent enterprises in the United States, and by other-
3 wise helping to give small business an opportunity to partici-
4 pate in the furnishing of commodities and services financed
5 with funds appropriated by this Act.

6 SEC. 620. During the current fiscal year, commuted ra-
7 tions for enlisted personnel of the uniformed services (as
8 defined in the Career Compensation Act of 1949) on leave,
9 or otherwise authorized to mess separately, shall be equiv-
10 alent to the cost of the ration as determined by the Sec-
11 retary of Defense.

12 SEC. 621. No appropriation contained in this Act shall
13 be available for expenses of operation of messes (other
14 than organized messes which are financed principally
15 from nonappropriated funds) at which meals are sold to
16 officers or civilians except under regulations approved by
17 the Secretary of Defense, which shall (except under un-
18 usual or extraordinary circumstances) establish rates for
19 such meals sufficient to provide reimbursement of operating
20 expenses and food costs to the appropriations concerned:
21 *Provided*, That, for the purposes of this section, payments
22 for meals at the rates established hereunder may be made
23 in cash or by deductions from the pay of civilian employees.

24 SEC. 622. No part of any appropriation contained

1 in this Act shall be available until expended unless ex-
2 pressly so provided elsewhere in this or some other appro-
3 priation Act.

4 SEC. 623. No part of any appropriation contained
5 in this Act shall be available for or on account of
6 the supply or replacement of table linen, dishes, glassware,
7 silver, and kitchen utensils for use in the residences or
8 quarters of officers on shore (other than for field messes,
9 messes temporarily set up on shore for bachelor officers and
10 officers attached to seagoing or district defense vessels, to
11 aviation units based on seagoing vessels, to the fleet air bases,
12 to the submarine bases, or to landing forces and expeditions) ,
13 except in accordance with regulations approved by the Sec-
14 retary of Defense, which shall provide for uniform practices
15 among all of the services.

16 SEC. 624. The provisions of the Act of February 9,
17 1946 (60 Stat. 3) , shall be applicable to the appropriations
18 of the Army and Air Force for military pay for the current
19 fiscal year, upon certification by the appropriate agency
20 of the department concerned.

21 SEC. 625. Not more than \$10,000,000 of the amounts
22 received during the current fiscal year by each of the De-
23 partments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force as proceeds
24 from the sale of scrap or salvage materials, shall be available
25 during the current fiscal year for expenses of transportation,

1 demilitarization, and other preparation for sale or salvage
2 of military supplies, equipment, and matériel: *Provided*,
3 That a report of receipts and disbursements under this limita-
4 tion shall be made quarterly to the Committees on Appro-
5 priations of the Congress.

6 SEC. 626. During the current fiscal year, the President
7 may exempt appropriations, funds, and contract author-
8 izations, available for military functions under the Depart-
9 ment of Defense, from the provisions of subsection (c) of
10 section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, whenever
11 he deems such action to be necessary in the interest of
12 national defense.

13 SEC. 627. Appropriations available during the current
14 fiscal year for the pay and allowances of midshipmen ap-
15 pointed under paragraph (b) of section 3 of the Act of
16 August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1058), as amended (34 U. S. C.
17 1020b), shall be available for a 50 per centum increase of
18 the pay of such midshipmen while in flight training or on
19 other flight duty.

20 SEC. 628. No appropriation contained in this Act shall
21 be available for any direct expense (including commercial
22 transportation in the United States to the place of sale but
23 excluding all transportation outside the United States) in
24 connection with the maintenance, conduct, operation, or
25 management of sales commissaries, or commissary stores, of

1 agencies of the Department of Defense, except where reim-
2 bursement for such expenses is to be made to the appro-
3 priations concerned from the proceeds of sales therein.

4 SEC. 629. No part of any appropriation contained in
5 this Act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any
6 person who engages in a strike against the Government of
7 the United States or who is a member of an organization
8 of Government employees that asserts the right to strike
9 against the Government of the United States, or who ad-
10 vocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates,
11 the overthrow of the Government of the United States by
12 force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an
13 affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the
14 person making the affidavit has not contrary to the provisions
15 of this section engaged in a strike against the Government of
16 the United States, is not a member of an organization of
17 Government employees that asserts the right to strike against
18 the Government of the United States, or that such person
19 does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization
20 that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the
21 United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That
22 any person who engages in a strike against the Government
23 of the United States or who is a member of an organization
24 of Government employees that asserts the right to strike
25 against the Government of the United States, or who advo-

1 cates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates,
2 the overthrow of the Government of the United States by
3 force or violence and accepts employment the salary or
4 wages for which are paid from any appropriation contained
5 in this Act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction,
6 shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned for not
7 more than one year, or both: *Provided further*, That the
8 above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in
9 substitution for, any other provisions of existing law.

10 SEC. 630. This Act may be cited as the "Department
11 of Defense Appropriation Act, 1952".

Passed the House of Representatives August 9, 1951.

Attest:

RALPH R. ROBERTS,

Clerk.

AN ACT

Making appropriations for the National Security Council, the National Security Resources Board, and for military functions administered by the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

August 10 (legislative day, August 1), 1951
Read twice and referred to the Committee on
Appropriations

Calendar No. 689

82D CONGRESS }
1st Session }

SENATE

{ REPORT
{ No. 730

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

SEPTEMBER 7 (legislative day, SEPTEMBER 4), 1951.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following

R E P O R T

[To accompany H. R. 5054]

The Committee on Appropriations, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 5054) making appropriations for the National Security Council, the National Security Resources Board, and for military functions administered by the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, report the same to the Senate with various amendments and present herewith information relative to the changes made.

The bill as passed by the House carried a total of \$56,034,717,200 for the National Security Council, the National Security Resources Board, the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, and the Department of the Air Force. No distinction was made between funds to be expended for necessary procurement during fiscal year 1952 and funds which, because of the long lead time required for the manufacture of numerous military commodities required by the three armed services, cannot possibly be expended until fiscal year 1953 or thereafter. It was deemed desirable, in order to make clear that the total sum appropriated will not flow into the stream of purchasing power during fiscal year 1952, to make a clear distinction in the bill between these two categories of expenditure. It will thus be made plain that the revenues of the Government for a single year will not be necessary to meet the expenditures authorized by this appropriation bill.

Including an additional appropriation of \$4,500,000,000 for the expansion of air power, the total amount carried in this bill as recommended by the committee for expenditure in 1953 and thereafter is \$23,148,621,000. The total expenditure for fiscal year 1952 including

an additional \$500,000,000 for the expansion of air power and including military procurement funds which will be available during 1952 and thereafter amounts to \$37,955,235,030. The amount of the bill as reported to the Senate, therefore, includes:

Funds to be expended in fiscal year 1952 and thereafter_____	\$37, 955, 235, 030
Funds to be expended in fiscal year 1953 and thereafter_____	23, 148, 621, 000
Total amount of bill as reported to the Senate for fiscal years 1952 and 1953 and thereafter_____	61, 103, 856, 030
Amount of increase by Senate (net)_____	5, 069, 138, 830
Amount of bill as passed the House_____	56, 034, 717, 200
Total estimates considered by the Senate including the amount contained in H. Doc. 120 and \$102,300,000 of the amount contained in H. Doc. 185_____	57, 679, 625, 700
Amount of appropriations, 1951_____	48, 205, 247, 443
The bill as reported to the Senate:	
Exceeds the appropriations for 1951_____	12, 898, 608, 587
Exceeds the estimates for 1952_____	3, 424, 230, 330

EXPENDITURES IN 1952

The great value of dividing the total cash appropriation carried in this bill into the two categories for expenditure in fiscal year 1952 and thereafter and fiscal year 1953 and thereafter, is illustrated by the fact that, by reason of the appropriations made in prior years to make certain that funds were on hand to enable the Department to order long lead items which sometimes take from 12 to 36 months to build and which are not paid for until delivered, there has been a substantial carry-over of funds from year to year. The latest figures available to the committee show that there is now available for expenditure in the Department of Defense, \$36,004,000,000 heretofore appropriated. This is divided among the three services as follows:

Army_____	\$13, 272, 000, 000
Navy_____	7, 319, 000, 000
Air Force_____	15, 413, 000, 000

The latest estimate of actual cash expenditures during fiscal year 1952 is \$39,284,000,000 which, in turn, is divided among the three services as follows:

Army_____	\$14, 959, 000, 000
Navy_____	11, 550, 000, 000
Air Force_____	12, 775, 000, 000

It cannot be overemphasized that expenditures necessarily lag behind appropriations.

NATIONAL EMERGENCY FUND

It was apparent to the committee that additional air power and supporting forces are required better to prepare the defense of the United States against sudden attack or other emergencies threatening the national security. The committee was unanimous in its belief that no time should be lost in the expansion of air power, but although there is an agreement within the Department of Defense and among the Joint Chiefs of Staff that additional air power and supporting forces are required, the details as to the size and composition of the additional forces have not yet been completed. For this reason there was not available to the committee specific amounts of additional funds required by appropriation. It was decided, therefore, to provide the National Emergency Fund of \$5,000,000,000 to be utilized by the Secretary of Defense after consultation with the Joint Chiefs of Staff and with the approval of the President, under the restriction, however, that before the funds may be allocated for use, a report must be made to the Appropriations Committees and the Armed Services Committees of the House and Senate 10 days prior to the actual transfer.

It is the opinion of the committee that the Department of Defense should expedite the preparation for plans as to size and composition of the additional forces and that these forces to be expanded, include the United States Air Force and the Navy, including the Marines. The committee further recommends that the Armed Services Committees of Congress undertake, at the earliest possible moment, the necessary studies of the kind and character of expansion desirable so that there may be complete cooperation among the services and between the Department of Defense and the Congress.

The purpose of the committee is to make sufficient funds available to permit an immediate start toward acquiring necessary additional air power. The fund here provided is for transfer principally to the following appropriations for the Department of the Air Force, "Aircraft and related procurement," "Major procurement other than aircraft," "Maintenance and operation," "Acquisition and construction of real property"; for the Department of the Navy, "Construction of aircraft and related procurement," "Aircraft and facilities," "Marine Corps troops and facilities," and "Public works." It is not planned to use any of these funds for the expansion of Army aviation, but the committee recognizes that it may be necessary to use the facilities of the Finance Service and the Ordnance Service of the Army and for this purpose not to exceed 5 percent of the aggregate amount authorized in this National Emergency Fund may be utilized for transfer to these services.

FORMULATION, MAINTENANCE, AND SUPPORT OF NOT LESS THAN 95
WINGS

In providing the National Emergency Fund, it is the hope of the committee that there may be no misunderstanding that the funds carried in this bill for the expansion of air power are intended to form, maintain, and support an Air Force of not less than 95 wings as well

as to expand naval aviation. The Department of the Air Force defines a wing and a group as follows:

A wing is a unit composed normally of one primary mission group and the necessary supporting groups such as the air base group, the maintenance and supply group, and the hospital group. Wing headquarters is the directing head for the four groups. It acts as a planning and policy organization with the operating functions decentralized to group and squadron level.

A group is an administrative or tactical unit composed of two or more squadrons. In other words, it may be a group which has airplanes in it, or it may be any of the other support groups named above. It has a headquarters which performs command and staff supervision over the squadrons assigned it. Squadrons consist of two or more flights with a varying number of airplanes depending on the type of squadron. For instance, fighter squadrons may have about 25 airplanes while a heavy bombardment squadron may have from 6 to 10 planes.

RETIRED PAY

The committee deleted an amendment which was added on the House floor providing that no part of the appropriation for retired pay be used for this purpose in payment of any member of the Regular Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Air Force who is retired after the date of enactment of this act unless he is unfit to perform the duties of his office by reason of physical disability incurred in line of duty or unless he has achieved the age at which retirement is required by law.

Witnesses before the Senate committee pointed out, among other things, that the proviso does not remove the existing legal requirements that certain officers, under specific requirements, be retired but that it merely denies them retirement pay. Furthermore, it was pointed out that there is no retirement age prescribed by law in regard to enlisted personnel. Under the proviso enlisted personnel, no matter how old or how long they served, could not be retired and paid retirement pay except for physical disability.

PUBLIC INFORMATION ACTIVITIES

The Department of Defense has requested \$15,622,903 for public information activities during fiscal 1952 by the Army, Navy, and Air Force, including civilian and military personnel employed in these activities in both departmental and field activities. The committee believes this amount to be excessive and has inserted language in the bill reducing the total amount which may be utilized for such purposes to \$10,950,000 to be equally divided among the three services after necessary amounts for the Office of the Secretary of Defense are deducted. The committee further directs the Department of Defense to assign such military personnel as can no longer be employed under this directive to military duties.

CEILING ON CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES

In order to prevent the unnecessary expansion of the employment of civilian employees in the Department of Defense, although the committee notes with approval the action already taken by the Department of Defense to restrict the expansion of civilian employment, it was deemed desirable to insert an amendment to provide a ceiling on graded civilian employment. The House made a general cut of 80,000 employees of which 29,600 were graded. The Department of Defense requested the restoration of 20,000 positions of

which 7,400 were in the category of graded civilian workers. The bill as passed by the House provided for 516,000 graded civilian employees and, with the addition of 7,400 as requested by the Department of Defense, the number carried in this bill is 523,400. In view of the fact, however, that the committee has recommended the expansion of air power and additional civilian employment may thereby be required, it was deemed that the ceiling could properly be fixed at 530,000.

It is to be noted that the committee has not fixed any ceiling on the ungraded or so-called blue-collar workers for the reason that it is not possible at this time to estimate how many additional workers in arsenals and navy yards and elsewhere may be required by reason of the expansion of military forces.

Attention is called to the fact that, as testified by Under Secretary Robert A. Lovett at the opening session of the committee hearings, the original requests of the various military forces for appropriations totaled \$104,000,000,000 and the Office of the Secretary of Defense, by rigid scrutiny of these requests, reduced the total budget to \$62,105,000,000 including \$4,500,000,000 for public works for which no specific appropriations were contained in the bill as it passed the House.

POSITIONS IN GRADES GS-17 AND GS-18

The hearings amply demonstrated the earnestness and industry with which the Department of Defense has been organizing the military program. The evidence demonstrated not only the magnitude but the complexity of the task with which the Secretary of Defense and his aids are confronted. Therefore, it has recommended that the request of the Department of Defense for authority to fill 15 temporary positions in grades GS-17 and GS-18 of the general schedule of the Classification Act of 1949 for essential managerial functions should be granted. For this reason, section 630 was inserted in the bill.

CHAUFFEURS

The committee has noted with disapproval the constantly increasing number of full-time and part-time chauffeurs employed by the Department of Defense. During the fiscal year 1951 there were employed in the United States 3,875 full-time and 3,726 part-time civilian and military personnel who acted as chauffeurs of passenger-carrying vehicles, exclusive of busses, carry-alls, and administrative jeeps. For 1952 it is estimated by the Department that 4,930 full-time and 4,227 part-time military and civilian personnel would be so employed.

With this in mind, the committee directs that the number of full-time and part-time military or civilian personnel employed as, or acting as, chauffeurs of passenger-carrying vehicles, exclusive of drivers of ambulances, busses, carry-alls, administrative jeeps, and combat vehicles shall not exceed the number so employed in the fiscal year 1951.

The committee further suggests that the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives investigate the need for the number of chauffeurs now employed by the Department of Defense with a view to offering substantive legislation if deemed advisable by the committees.

PURCHASE OF MEAT BY THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

For several years the Congress has included a provision in the military appropriation bill which prohibits the purchase overseas of food and clothing for the armed services when such items of food and clothing are available in the United States. This provision has been included by the House and is recommended by the committee. The provision does not specifically name the items of food and clothing which are intended to be covered; however it has always been the intention of the Congress that the restriction specifically include the purchase of meat for consumptive use by the armed services. Under a recent decision by the Comptroller General, the Army has been required to purchase domestically, so long as it is available in sufficient quantity and quality at United States market prices, the meat which is resold in overseas commissary stores, excluding the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska. This in turn has caused meat prices in overseas commissary stores to be higher than meat prices in local commercial establishments and has caused military dependents, otherwise patronizing overseas commissary stores, to purchase meat from local sources not subject to Army inspection. The committee is of the opinion that the provision was never intended to apply to meat purchased for resale at overseas commissaries and therefore directs that the provision be interpreted so as to allow for such purchases. During the course of the hearings on this proposal, representatives of the meat packers and the cattle growers testified in favor of allowing the Army to purchase meat offshore to meet these overseas resale requirements.

WORKING CAPITAL FUND

The committee deleted the proviso in the bill stating that none of the funds appropriated in this or any other act, and none of the property procured therewith shall be available for transfer to any working capital fund under the provisions of section 405 (d) of the National Security Act, as amended. This action was strongly urged by the Acting Secretary of Defense and by the representatives of the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force. The Comptroller General of the United States, after citing the advantages derived from working capital funds, stated as follows:

The enactment of the House proviso would greatly retard progress under the program which has been going forward. While I am not advised of the information on which the House based its action, other than as indicated in House Report 790, pages 15, 16, 44, the proviso appears to be sweeping with respect to the establishment of all forms of working-capital funds without specific congressional approval. It would thus negate the provisions of the National Security Act amendments which were considered to be necessary for a temporary period to provide for an orderly transition to the new methods of financial budgeting and accounting contemplated by that act.

In view of the intrinsic merit of the working-capital-fund concept, its demonstrated advantages in the majority of cases as a means of more businesslike management and better control of inventories, and the fact that the attainment of these objectives would be seriously impeded if the proviso in question were enacted, I feel that its enactment would not be in the best interest of the Government.

RELEASE OF INACTIVE AND VOLUNTEER RESERVISTS

The committee deleted section 604 (b) of the bill. This provided that no part of any appropriation contained in this act for "Pay and

allowances" of military personnel shall be expended for the pay or allowances, accruing after November 30, 1951, of any member of the Inactive or Volunteer Reserve who served on active duty for 12 months or more in any branch of the Armed Forces during the period beginning December 7, 1941, and ending September 2, 1945, if such member shall have served on active duty for a period of 12 months or more after June 26, 1950, unless such member shall have voluntarily consented to remain on active duty.

In taking this action, the committee, while deeply sympathetic with the objectives motivating the amendment, was impressed by the arguments of the Department of Defense and more particularly those of the Joint Chiefs of Staff who stated that the passage of this section would have extremely serious adverse effects on the combat effectiveness of the armed services. Under these circumstances the committee had no alternative but to delete the provision and thus permit the orderly release of Inactive and Volunteer Reservists in accordance with the present plans of the services.

The committee strongly feels that the plans of the armed services should be coordinated with the provisions of the Universal Military Training Act and that inactive and volunteer reservists of prior war service should be discharged as soon as possible consistent with defense needs. Short of all-out global war the committee does not expect any branch of the armed services to call any more men involuntarily into service who have had 12 months' service during World War II.

COMMISSARY STORES

The purpose of section 628, as amended, is to require the commissary stores of the Department of the Army and the Department of the Air Force to reflect in their commissary stores prices the overhead costs presently reflected in the prices of commissary stores of the Department of the Navy. These include the cost of purchase and maintenance of operating equipment and supplies, the actual or estimated cost of heat, light, power and water and of shrinkage, spoilage and pilferage of merchandise under the control of commissary stores. With respect to these costs it was believed that commissary stores of the three military departments should be on the same basis and that any increase in prices in Army and Air Force stores required to provide sufficient revenue to reimburse the appropriations concerned for such costs was not inequitable to service personnel. This provision is to become effective January 1, 1952, in order to permit the military departments the minimum necessary time required to prepare their regulations for world-wide application.

GRATUITIES TO FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

The committee has noted with concern the disclosure of evidence indicating that officials in the Military Department who could influence the awarding of contracts have received various types of gratuities from contractors or agents of contractors seeking Government business. In an attempt to check this practice, the committee has introduced a new section 631 to the bill which would give the Government certain discretionary power to terminate contracts if the secretary of the department concerned finds that any gratuity has been offered by a contractor, or his representative, to a Federal

employee or officer with a view toward securing a contract or securing favorable treatment with respect to the awarding or amending, or the making of any determinations with respect to the performing of such contract. Penalties are also provided in the new section against the contractor.

It is to be understood that the provisions of this section shall be applicable to contractors or representatives of contractors offering such gratuities after the enactment of this provision into law.

INCREASES AND LIMITATIONS

Office of the Secretary of Defense:

Salaries and expenses.....	\$650, 000
----------------------------	------------

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$14,450,000, which is \$650,000 over the House allowance, and \$350,000 under the budget estimate. The increase will provide for 115 additional average civilian positions or a total of 1,974.

Retired pay:

The committee recommends deletion of the following proviso in the bill:

: *Provided*, That no part of such sum shall be used to pay the retired or retirement pay of any member of the Regular Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Air Force who is retired after the date of enactment of this Act, unless such member was retired because of (1) being unfit to perform the duties of his office, rank, grade, or rating by reason of a physical disability incurred in line of duty, or (2) achieving the age at which retirement is required by law

National Emergency Fund.....	5, 000, 000, 000
------------------------------	------------------

The committee recommends that the following paragraph be added to the bill:

NATIONAL EMERGENCY FUND

For transfer by the Secretary of Defense for urgent Military requirements, after consultation with the Joint Chiefs of Staff and with the approval of the President, to any appropriation for military functions under the Department of Defense, to be expended to expedite the procurement and facility programs of the Department of Defense necessary to provide for an expansion of air power and necessary supporting forces for the United States Air Force and the United States Navy to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes, and for the same time period, as the appropriation to which transferred, \$500,000,000 for expenditure during fiscal year 1952 and thereafter and \$4,500,000,000 for expenditure during fiscal year 1953 and thereafter for the purposes authorized in this paragraph: Provided, That the limitation on the availability of any appropriation to which transfers are made hereunder is hereby increased by the amount of any such transfers: Provided further, That a report of transfers proposed under this item shall be made to the Appropriations Committees and the Armed Services Committees of the Congress ten days prior to the actual transfer.

Total, Office of the Secretary of Defense.....	5, 000, 650, 000
--	------------------

INCREASES AND LIMITATIONS—Continued

Department of the Army:

Finance Service, Army:

Pay of the Army:

The committee recommends that the following provision be added to the bill:

: Provided further, That all payments for accrued leave made to enlisted members, discharged for the purpose of immediate reenlistment for an indefinite period, at Fort Myer, Virginia, during the period April 1, 1949 to September 30, 1949, both dates inclusive, are hereby validated notwithstanding the provisions of section 4 (c) of the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946, as amended by the Act of August 4, 1947 (Public Law 350, 80th Congress): Provided further, That where such erroneous payments of accrued leave have been collected by, or refunded to, the United States, reimbursement thereof shall be effected by the General Accounting Office upon receipt of a claim therefor from the said member or that person or persons entitled to receive the arrears of pay of such member in accordance with the Act of June 30, 1906, as amended, 10 U. S. C. 868: Provided further, That the Comptroller General of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to allow credit in the accounts of disbursing officers for any payments validated hereby

Quartermaster Service, Army:

Clothing and equipage-----

\$132, 400, 000

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$1,639,081 000, which is an increase of \$132,400,000 over the House allowance, and \$8,600,000 under the budget estimate. The additional sum will provide \$130,000,000 for the purchase of clothing and equipage and \$2,400,000 for the pay of personnel.

The committee recommends deletion of the following proviso in the House bill:

: Provided, That none of the funds appropriated in this or any other Act, and none of the property procured therewith, shall be available for transfer to any working capital fund under the provisions of section 405 (d) of the National Security Act, as amended.

Incidental expenses of the Army-----

6, 600, 000

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$194,514,000 or an increase of \$6,600,000 over the House allowance, and a decrease of \$4,400,000 under the budget estimate. The additional sum will provide \$4,600,000 for the employment of 1,592 persons in depots, Army areas and overseas commands, and \$2,000,000 for activities other than personnel.

The committee also recommends the following provision:

: Provided, That expenditures of appropriations contained in this Act for public informational activities of the Department of Defense shall not exceed \$10,950,000 including pay and allowances of military personnel assigned to such activities

INCREASES AND LIMITATIONS—Continued

Department of the Army—Continued

Transportation Corps:

Transportation Service, Army:

The committee recommends that the sum provided in the House bill be separated as follows:

\$938,515,000 for expenditure during fiscal year 1952 and thereafter and \$30,000,000 for expenditure during fiscal year 1953 and thereafter for the purposes authorized in this paragraph

Signal Corps:

Signal Service of the Army-----

\$4, 224, 000

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$1,217,931,000 which is \$4,224,000 over the House allowance and is \$25,776,000 under the estimate. The additional sum will permit the restoration of approximately 1,176 man-years required under the House reduction.

The committee also recommends that the sum provided in the bill be separated as follows:

\$817,931,000 for expenditure during fiscal year 1952 and thereafter and \$400,000,000 for expenditure during fiscal year 1953 and thereafter for the purposes authorized in this paragraph

Medical Service:

Medical and Hospital Department:

The committee recommends that the sum provided in the House bill be separated as follows:

\$259,580,000 for expenditure during fiscal year 1952 and thereafter and \$10,000,000 for expenditure during fiscal year 1953 and thereafter for the purposes authorized in this paragraph

Corps of Engineers:

Engineer Service, Army:

The committee recommends that the sum provided in the House bill be separated as follows:

\$1,126,049,000 for expenditure during fiscal year 1952 and thereafter and \$40,000,000 for expenditure during fiscal year 1953 and thereafter for the purposes authorized in this paragraph

Chemical Corps:

Chemical Service, Army:

The committee recommends that the sum provided in the House bill be separated as follows:

\$102,560,000 for expenditure during fiscal year 1952 and thereafter and \$20,000,000 for expenditure during fiscal year 1953 and thereafter for the purposes authorized in this paragraph

INCREASES AND LIMITATIONS—Continued

Department of the Army—Continued

Departmental salaries:

Secretary of the Army-----	\$98, 400
----------------------------	-----------

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$3,723,400, which is the estimate, and exceeds the House allowance by \$98,400. The additional sum will permit the employment of personnel needed in the Armed Services Renegotiation Board.

Office of Judge Advocate General-----	43, 000
---------------------------------------	---------

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$743,000, which is an increase of \$43,000 over the House allowance, and is \$18,000 below the estimate. The additional sum will permit the employment of necessary clerical and other assistance required in the boards of review.

Office of Quartermaster General-----	250, 000
--------------------------------------	----------

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$9,875,000, which is an increase of \$250,000 over the House allowance, and is \$250,600 under the budget estimate. The additional sum will provide approximately 60 average positions.

Office of Chief of Transportation-----	224, 000
--	----------

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$4,024,000 which is \$224,000 over the House allowance, and \$300 under the estimate. The additional amount will provide about 60 positions.

Office of Chief of Ordnance-----	250, 000
----------------------------------	----------

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$6,750,000 which is \$250,000 over the House allowance and is \$117,000 under the budget estimate. The additional sum will permit the employment of personnel required by the increased workload.

Total, Department of the Army-----	144, 089, 400
------------------------------------	---------------

Department of the Navy:

Construction of Aircraft and related procurement:

The committee recommends that the sum provided in the House bill be separated as follows:

\$1,050,000,000 for expenditure during fiscal year 1952 and thereafter and \$2,950,000,000 for expenditure during fiscal year 1953 and thereafter for the purposes authorized in this paragraph

Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy:

The committee recommends that the sum provided in the House bill be separated as follows:

\$245,040,000 for expenditure during fiscal year 1952 and thereafter and \$1,098,257,000 for expenditure during fiscal year 1953 and thereafter for the purposes authorized in this paragraph

Ordnance for shipbuilding and conversion:

The committee recommends that the sum provided in the House bill be separated as follows:

\$75,000,000 for expenditure during fiscal year 1952 and thereafter and \$356,390,000 for expenditure during fiscal year 1953 and thereafter for the purposes authorized in this paragraph

INCREASES AND LIMITATIONS—Continued

Department of the Navy—Continued

Public Works, Navy-----	\$1, 243, 000
-------------------------	---------------

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$51,657,000, which is \$1,243,000 over the House allowance. The increase recommended by the committee is to be used for construction, installation, or repair of sewage facilities at the naval base, Newport, R. I.

Total, Department of the Navy-----	1, 243, 000
------------------------------------	-------------

Department of the Air Force:

Aircraft and related procurement:

The committee recommends that the sum provided in the House bill be separated as follows:

\$3,215,800,000 for expenditure during fiscal year 1952 and thereafter and \$8,000,000,000 for expenditure during fiscal year 1953 and thereafter for the purposes authorized in this paragraph

Major procurement other than aircraft-----	50, 000, 000
--	--------------

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$1,800,000,000 which is the budget estimate and is \$50,000,000 over the House allowance. The additional sum will enable the Air Force to fulfill minimum requirements of the 95-wing Air Force.

The committee also recommends that the sum provided in the bill be separated as follows:

\$1,000,000,000 for expenditure during fiscal year 1952 and thereafter and \$800,000,000 for expenditure during fiscal year 1953 and thereafter for the purposes authorized in this paragraph

Acquisition and construction of real property-----	102, 300, 000
--	---------------

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$187,300,000, which is \$102,300,000 over the House allowance. The additional sum permits the continuance of construction of four classified Air Force installations.

The committee recommends deletion of the following language:

For an additional amount for "Acquisition and construction of real property", to remain available until expended, \$85,000,000, for payment of obligations incurred under authority heretofore granted under this head to enter into contracts.

and that the following language be inserted in lieu thereof:

For the continuation of the construction of four classified projects authorized by Public Law 910, Eighty-first Congress, approved January 6, 1951, and Public Law 43, Eighty-second Congress, approved May 31, 1951, to remain available until expended, \$187,300,000 of which \$85,000,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority heretofore granted under this heading to enter into contracts.

Research and Development:

The committee recommends that the sum provided in the House bill be separated as follows:

\$225,000,000 for expenditure during fiscal year 1952 and thereafter and \$200,000,000 for expenditure during fiscal year 1953 and thereafter for the purposes authorized in this paragraph.

INCREASES AND LIMITATIONS—Continued

Department of the Air Force—Continued

Reserve Personnel Requirements.....	\$2, 300, 000
-------------------------------------	---------------

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$19,843,000, or an increase of \$2,300,000 over the House allowance, and \$3,257,000 under the budget estimate. The additional sum will permit the expansion of the Air Force Reserve training program.

The committee also recommends the addition of the following authorization:

*or on duty under section 5, National Defense Act,
as authorized by law*

Total, Department of the Air Force..	154, 600, 000
--------------------------------------	---------------

Total increase, all activities.....	5, 300, 582, 400
-------------------------------------	------------------

General Provisions:

Sec. 604 (b):

The committee recommends deletion of the following language:

(b) No part of any appropriation contained in this Act for "Pay and allowances" of military personnel shall be expended for the pay or allowances, accruing after November 30, 1951, of any member of the inactive or volunteer reserve who served on active duty for a period of twelve months or more in any branch of the Armed Forces during the period beginning December 7, 1941, and ending September 2, 1945, if such member shall have served on active duty for a period of twelve months or more after June 26, 1950, unless such member shall have voluntarily consented to remain on active duty.

Sec. 610:

The committee recommends insertion in the bill of the following language:

Specifically approved by the Secretary of the Department concerned and

so that the amended section will read as follows:

Sec. 610. Appropriations contained in this Act shall be available for insurance of official motor vehicles in foreign countries, when required by laws of such countries; payments in advance of expenses determined by the investigating officer to be necessary and in accord with local custom for conducting investigations in foreign countries incident to matters relating to the activities of the department concerned; reimbursement of General Services Administration for security guard services for protection of confidential files; examination of estimates of appropriations and Department of Defense activities in the field and the use of such appropriations for such purpose shall be subject only to regulation by the standing committees concerned; and all necessary expenses, at the seat of government of the United States of America or elsewhere, in connection with (1) instruction and training, including tuition, *specifically approved by the Secretary of the Department con-*

INCREASES AND LIMITATIONS—Continued

General Provisions—Continued

Sec. 610—Continued

cerned and not otherwise provided for, of civilian employees, and (2) communication and other services and supplies as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

Sec. 628:

The committee recommends deletion of the section as contained in the House bill as follows:

SEC. 628. No appropriation contained in this Act shall be available for any direct expense (including commercial transportation in the United States to the place of sale but excluding all transportation outside the United States) in connection with the maintenance, conduct, operation, or management of sales commissaries, or commissary stores, of agencies of the Department of Defense, except where reimbursement for such expenses is to be made to the appropriations concerned from the proceeds of sales therein.

and the insertion in lieu thereof of the following section:

SEC. 628. No appropriation contained in this Act, shall be available on and after January 1, 1952, in connection with the operation of commissary stores of the agencies of the Department of Defense for the cost of purchase and maintenance of operating equipment and supplies and for the actual or estimated cost of utilities as may be furnished by the Government and of shrinkage, spoilage, and pilferage of merchandise under the control of such commissary stores, except as authorized under regulations promulgated by the Secretaries of the military departments concerned, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense, which regulations shall provide for reimbursement therefor to the appropriations concerned and, notwithstanding any other provision of law, shall provide for the adjustment of the sales prices in such commissary stores to the extent necessary to furnish sufficient gross revenue from sales of commissary stores to make such reimbursement: Provided, however, That under such regulations as may be issued pursuant to this section all utilities may be furnished without cost to the commissary stores outside the continental United States and in Alaska.

Sec. 630:

The committee recommends insertion in the bill of the following new section:

SEC. 630. In order more effectively to administer the programs and functions of the Department of Defense, the President, to the extent he deems it necessary and appropriate in the interest of national defense, may authorize within the Office of the Secretary of Defense fifteen temporary positions to be placed in grades GS-17 and GS-18 of the general schedule of the Classification Act of 1949 in accordance with the procedures and standards of that Act. Not more than eight of these positions shall be in grade GS-18. Such positions shall be additional to the number authorized by section 505 of that Act.

INCREASES AND LIMITATIONS—Continued

General Provisions—Continued

Sec. 631:

The committee recommends insertion in the bill of the following new section:

SEC. 631. No part of any money appropriated in titles II, III, IV, or V of this Act shall be expended under any contract (other than a contract for personal services) entered into after the enactment of this Act unless such contract provides—

(1) that the Government may, by written notice to the contractor, terminate the right of such contractor to proceed under such contract if it is found, after notice and hearing, by the Secretary of the military department with which the contract is made, or his designee, that gratuities (in the form of entertainment, gifts, or otherwise) were offered by such contractor, or any agent or representative of such contractor, to any officer or employee of the Government with a view toward securing a contract or securing favorable treatment with respect to the awarding or amending, or the making of any determinations with respect to the performing, of such contract: Provided, That the existence of the facts upon which such Secretary makes such findings shall be in issue and may be reviewed in any competent court.

(2) that in the event any such contract is so terminated the Government shall be entitled, (A) to pursue the same remedies against the contractor as it could pursue in the event of a breach of the contract by the contractor, and (B) as a penalty in addition to any other damages to which it may be entitled by law, to exemplary damages in an amount not less than three nor more than ten times (as determined by the Secretary or his designee) the costs incurred by any such contractor in providing any such gratuities to any such officer or employee.

Sec. 632:

The committee recommends insertion in the bill of the following new section:

SEC. 632. No funds appropriated in titles II, III, IV, and V of this Act shall be used for the payment in excess of 530,000 full-time graded civilian employees at any one time during the current fiscal year.

DECREASES AND LIMITATIONS

Department of the Army:

Ordinance Service and Supplies, Army-----	\$231, 443, 570
---	-----------------

The decrease recommended by the committee has the approval of the Ordnance Service and is based upon their current reexamination of fund requirements and subsequent reduction in the number of armored personnel carriers needed.

The committee also recommends that the sum provided in the bill be separated as follows:

\$3,332,082,430 for expenditure during fiscal year 1952 and thereafter and \$4,743,974,000 for expenditure during fiscal 1953 and thereafter for the purposes authorized in this paragraph

Total decreases-----	231, 443, 570
----------------------	---------------

RECAPITULATION

Total increases-----	5, 300, 582, 400
----------------------	------------------

Total decreases-----	231, 443, 570
----------------------	---------------

Net increase-----	5, 069, 138, 830
-------------------	------------------

Amount of bill as passed House-----	56, 034, 717, 200
-------------------------------------	-------------------

Net increase-----	5, 069, 138, 830
-------------------	------------------

Amount of bill as recommended to Senate---	61, 103, 856, 030
--	-------------------

The following table summarizes by activities the 1951 appropriations, the 1952 budget estimates, the amounts allowed by the House, and the amounts recommended by the committee:

Activity	Appropriations, 1951	Budget estimates, 1952	Allowed by House, 1952	Recommended by Senate committee, 1952	Increase (+) or decrease (-), compared with—		
					Appropriations, 1951	Estimates, 1952	House bill, 1952
National Security Council.....	\$160,000	\$160,000	\$160,000	\$160,000			
National Security Resources Board.....	3,500,000	1,600,000	1,600,000	1,600,000	-\$1,900,000		
Office of the Secretary of Defense.....	684,300,000	544,800,000	528,800,000	5,529,450,000	+4,845,150,000	+\$4,984,650,000	+\$5,000,650,000
Department of the Army.....	19,204,152,143	20,798,845,700	20,113,524,200	20,026,170,030	+782,017,887	-772,675,670	-87,354,170
Department of the Navy.....	12,462,074,300	15,737,920,000	15,543,648,000	15,544,891,000	+3,082,816,700	-193,029,000	+1,243,000
Department of the Air Force.....	15,791,061,000	120,596,300,000	19,846,985,000	20,001,585,000	+4,210,524,000	-594,715,000	1 +154,600,000
Total.....	48,205,247,443	57,679,625,700	56,034,717,200	61,103,856,030	+12,898,608,587	+3,424,230,330	+5,069,138,830

1 Includes \$102,300,000 contained in H. Doc. No. 185 and not yet considered by House.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1951, ESTIMATES FOR 1952, AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 1952—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

TITLE I—INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

Item	Appropriations, 1951 (adjusted)	Budget estimates, 1952	Recommended in House bill for 1952	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (-), Senate bill compared with—		
					Appropriations, 1951	Estimates, 1952	House bill
NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL							
Salaries and expenses.....	\$160,000	\$160,000	\$160,000	\$160,000			
NATIONAL SECURITY RESOURCES BOARD							
Salaries and expenses.....	3,500,000	1,600,000	1,600,000	1,600,000	-\$1,900,000		
Total, title I—Independent agencies.....	3,660,000	1,760,000	1,760,000	1,760,000	-\$1,900,000		

TITLE II—OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE							
Salaries and expenses.....	\$12,300,000	\$14,800,000	\$13,800,000	\$14,450,000	+\$2,150,000	-\$350,000	+\$650,000
Claims.....	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000			
Retired pay.....	342,000,000	360,000,000	345,000,000	345,000,000	+3,000,000	-15,000,000	
Contingencies.....	85,000,000	75,000,000	75,000,000	75,000,000	-10,000,000		
Emergency fund.....	240,000,000	90,000,000	90,000,000	90,000,000	-150,000,000		
National emergency fund.....				5,000,000,000	+5,000,000,000	+5,000,000,000	+5,000,000,000
Total, title II—Office of the Secretary of Defense.....	684,300,000	544,800,000	528,800,000	5,529,450,000	+4,845,150,000	+4,984,650,000	+5,000,650,000

1 Original estimate of \$4,000,000 reduced \$2,400,000 in H. Doc. No. 194.

TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF THE ARMY									
Contingencies of the Army.....		\$80,378,000	\$88,035,000	\$88,000,000	\$88,000,000	+\$7,022,000	—\$55,000	-----	-----
Civilian relief in Korea.....		50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	-----	-----	-----	-----
Expediting production.....		1,100,000,000	1,100,000,000	1,000,000,000	1,000,000,000	—100,000,000	—100,000,000	-----	-----
National Board for Promotion of Rifle Practice.....		160,000	130,000	130,000	130,000	—30,000	-----	-----	-----
Total, Office of the Secretary of Army.....		1,231,138,000	1,238,185,000	1,138,130,000	1,138,130,000	—93,008,000	—100,035,000	-----	-----
GENERAL STAFF CORPS									
Special field exercises.....		5,350,000	16,000,000	16,000,000	16,000,000	+10,650,000	-----	-----	-----
Inter-American relations.....		432,000	388,000	388,000	388,000	—44,000	-----	-----	-----
Total, General Staff Corps.....		5,782,000	16,388,000	16,388,000	16,388,000	+10,606,000	-----	-----	-----
FINANCE CORPS									
Pay of the Army.....		2,443,100,000	3,308,425,000	3,297,076,000	3,297,076,000	+853,976,000	—11,349,000	-----	-----
Travel of the Army.....		177,000,000	254,000,000	245,000,000	245,000,000	+68,000,000	—9,000,000	-----	-----
Finance service employees.....		40,030,000	48,423,000	48,423,000	48,423,000	+8,393,000	-----	-----	-----
Total, Finance Department.....		2,660,130,000	3,610,848,000	3,590,499,000	3,590,499,000	+930,369,000	—20,349,000	-----	-----
QUARTERMASTER CORPS									
Welfare of enlisted men.....		18,926,500	50,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000	+1,073,500	-----	-----	-----
Subsistence of the Army.....		912,293,000	603,309,000	603,309,000	603,309,000	—308,984,000	-----	-----	-----
Regular supplies of the Army.....		489,108,258	485,351,000	465,000,000	465,000,000	—24,108,258	—20,351,000	-----	-----
Clothing and equipage.....		1,697,367,365	2,164,681,000	1,506,681,000	1,639,081,000	—58,286,365	—8,600,000	+\$132,400,000	-----
Incidental expenses of the Army.....		172,235,313	198,914,000	187,914,000	194,514,000	+22,278,687	—4,400,000	+6,600,000	-----
Total, Quartermaster Corps.....		3,289,930,436	2,955,255,000	2,782,904,000	2,921,904,000	—308,026,436	—33,351,000	+139,000,000	-----
TRANSPORTATION CORPS									
Transportation service, Army.....		1,076,963,000	978,515,000	968,515,000	968,515,000	—108,448,000	—10,000,000	-----	-----

* Includes \$1,130,000 for stockpiling.

*Comparative statement of appropriations for 1951, estimates for 1952, and amounts recommended in the bill for 1952—
Department of Defense appropriation bill, 1952—Continued*

TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY—Continued

Item	Appropriations, 1951 (adjusted)	Budget estimates, 1952	Recommended in House bill for 1952	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (—), Senate bill compared with—	
					Appropriations, 1951	Estimates, 1952 House bill
SIGNAL CORPS						
Signal service of the Army.....	\$1, 147, 331, 000	\$1, 243, 707, 000	\$1, 213, 707, 000	\$1, 217, 931, 000	+\$70, 600, 000	+\$4, 224, 000
Alaska communication system:						
Operation and maintenance.....	4, 187, 000	4, 176, 000	4, 176, 000	4, 176, 000	—11, 000	-----
Construction.....	1, 140, 000	1, 400, 000	1, 400, 000	1, 400, 000	+250, 000	-----
Total, Signal Corps.....	1, 152, 658, 000	1, 249, 283, 000	1, 219, 283, 000	1, 223, 507, 000	+70, 849, 000	—25, 776, 000
MEDICAL SERVICE						
Medical and Hospital Department.....	174, 563, 000	272, 059, 000	269, 580, 000	269, 580, 000	+95, 017, 000	-----
CORPS OF ENGINEERS						
Engineer service.....	1, 538, 154, 500	1, 201, 049, 000	1, 166, 049, 000	1, 166, 049, 000	—372, 105, 500	—35, 000, 000
Military construction.....	499, 970, 585	48, 363, 700	48, 363, 700	48, 363, 700	—451, 606, 885	-----
Total, Corps of Engineers.....	2, 038, 125, 085	1, 249, 412, 700	1, 214, 412, 700	1, 214, 412, 700	—823, 712, 385	—35, 000, 000
ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT						
Ordnance service and supplies.....	6, 987, 636, 000	8, 616, 011, 000	8, 307, 500, 000	8, 076, 056, 430	+1, 088, 420, 430	—539, 954, 570
CHEMICAL CORPS						
Chemical service.....	120, 253, 000	122, 560, 000	122, 560, 000	122, 560, 000	+2, 307, 000	-----
ARMY TRAINING						
Army training.....	14, 097, 000	22, 500, 000	22, 300, 000	22, 300, 000	+8, 203, 000	—200, 000

*Comparative statement of appropriations for 1951, estimates for 1952, and amounts recommended in the bill for 1952—
Department of Defense appropriation bill, 1952—Continued*

TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY—Continued

Item	Appropriations, 1951 (adjusted)	Budget estimates, 1952	Recommended in House bill for 1952	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (—), Senate bill compared with—		
					Appropriations, 1951	Estimates, 1952	House bill
SALARIES—continued							
Chief of Chemical Corps.....	\$1, 111, 957	\$1, 523, 600	\$1, 500, 000	\$1, 500, 000	+\$388, 043	—\$23, 600	-----
Chief of Chaplains.....	147, 730	170, 000	170, 000	170, 000	+22, 270	-----	-----
Total, salaries.....	57, 881, 622	70, 000, 000	66, 214, 500	67, 079, 900	+9, 198, 278	—2, 920, 100	+ \$865, 400
Contingent expenses.....	27, 531, 000	30, 750, 000	30, 000, 000	30, 000, 000	+2, 469, 000	—750, 000	-----
Total, title III—Department of the Army, general.....	19, 264, 152, 143	20, 798, 845, 700	20, 113, 524, 200	20, 026, 170, 030	+762, 017, 887	—772, 675, 670	—87, 354, 170
Special accounts:							
Secretary of the Army:							
Replacement of personal property sold.....	1, 785, 757	1, 250, 300	1, 250, 300	1, 250, 300	—535, 457	-----	-----
Preparation for sale or salvage of military property.....	10, 000, 000	10, 000, 000	10, 000, 000	10, 000, 000	-----	-----	-----
Total, Secretary of the Army.....	11, 785, 757	11, 250, 300	11, 250, 300	11, 250, 300	—535, 457	-----	-----
Corps of Engineers: Defense production guaranties.....	50, 000	800, 000	800, 000	800, 000	+750, 000	-----	-----
Finance Department: Expenses and losses, financing war contracts.....	1, 806	165	165	165	—1, 641	-----	-----
Total, special accounts, Department of the Army.....	11, 837, 563	12, 050, 465	12, 050, 465	12, 050, 465	+212, 902	-----	-----
Total, title III, Department of the Army, general and special appropriations.....	19, 275, 989, 706	20, 810, 896, 165	20, 125, 574, 665	20, 038, 220, 495	+762, 230, 789	—772, 675, 670	—87, 354, 170

TITLE IV—DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Military personnel:					
Navy.....	\$1,825,073,000	\$2,463,365,000	\$2,456,475,000	\$2,456,475,000	+\$631,402,000
Naval Reserve.....	57,137,000	62,718,000	62,718,000	62,718,000	+5,581,000
Officer candidates.....	18,899,300	19,807,000	19,348,000	19,348,000	+448,700
Navy personnel, general expenses.....	121,850,000	97,970,000	97,570,000	97,570,000	-24,280,000
Military personnel, Marine Corps.....	476,158,000	565,459,000	565,459,000	565,459,000	+89,301,000
Military personnel, Marine Corps Reserve.....	7,439,000	15,145,000	15,145,000	15,145,000	+7,706,000
Marine Corps, troops and facilities.....	611,127,000	1,052,970,000	1,018,120,000	1,018,120,000	+406,983,000
Aircraft and facilities.....	902,693,000	925,393,000	923,393,000	923,393,000	+20,700,000
Construction of aircraft and related procurement.....	2,880,629,000	4,022,476,000	4,000,000,000	4,000,000,000	+1,119,371,000
Ships and facilities.....	1,553,978,000	1,605,424,000	1,537,452,000	1,537,452,000	-67,972,000
Construction of ships.....	747,200,000	77,353,000	77,353,000	77,353,000	-669,847,000
Shipbuilding and conversion.....		1,343,297,000	1,343,297,000	1,343,297,000	+1,343,297,000
Ordnance and facilities.....	1,440,451,000	1,347,668,000	1,335,668,000	1,335,668,000	-104,783,000
Ordnance for new construction.....	105,800,000	52,445,000	52,445,000	52,445,000	-53,355,000
Ordnance for shipbuilding and conversion.....		431,390,000	431,390,000	431,390,000	+431,390,000
Increase and replacement of naval vessels:					
Construction and machinery.....	83,800,000	45,000,000	45,000,000	45,000,000	-38,800,000
Armor, armament, and ammunition.....	47,400,000	12,656,000	12,656,000	12,656,000	-34,744,000
Medical care.....	127,138,000	136,545,000	135,770,000	135,770,000	+8,632,000
Civil engineering.....	154,457,000	203,488,000	196,488,000	196,488,000	+42,031,000
Public works (new).....	469,794,000	50,414,000	50,414,000	51,657,000	-418,127,000
Research.....	75,168,000	69,698,000	69,698,000	69,698,000	+5,470,000
					+\$1,243,000

⁴ Includes \$23,000,000 to be transferred to "Facilities."

⁵ Includes \$21,145,000 to be transferred to "Facilities."

⁶ Includes \$38,510,000 to be transferred to "Facilities."

*Comparative statement of appropriations for 1951, estimates for 1952, and amounts recommended in the bill for 1952--
Department of Defense appropriation bill, 1952--Continued*

TITLE IV--DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY--Continued

Item	Appropriations, 1951 (adjusted)	Budget estimates, 1952	Recommended in House bill for 1952	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (-), Senate bill compared with--	
					Appropriations, 1951	Estimates, 1952 House bill
Service-wide supply and finance.....	\$412,290,000	\$497,602,000	\$485,102,000	\$485,102,000	+\$72,812,000	-\$12,500,000
Service-wide operations.....	183,478,000	152,729,000	150,779,000	150,779,000	-32,699,000	-1,950,000
Island governments.....	2,125,000				-2,125,000	
Operation and conservation of naval petroleum reserves.....	4,000,000	11,903,000	11,903,000	11,903,000	+7,903,000	
Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4, Alaska.....	11,000,000				-11,000,000	
Navy stock fund.....	143,000,000	475,000,000	450,000,000	450,000,000	+307,000,000	-25,000,000
Total, title IV--Department of the Navy, general.....	12,462,074,300	15,737,920,000	15,543,648,000	15,544,891,000	+3,082,816,700	-193,029,000
Special accounts, Department of the Navy:						
Preparation for sale or salvage of military property.....	1,792,500	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	+2,207,500	
Defense production guaranties.....	400,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	+1,600,000	
Laundry service, Naval Academy.....	415,241	445,225	445,225	445,225	+29,984	
Preservation, cataloging, etc. of stocks.....	4,597,155				-4,597,155	
Replacement of personal property sold.....	3,700,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	-1,700,000	
Preservation of frigate <i>Constellation</i>		50,000	50,000	50,000	+50,000	
Total, special account, Department of the Navy.....	10,904,896	8,495,225	8,495,225	8,495,225	-2,409,671	
Total, title IV--General and special accounts, Department of the Navy.....	12,472,979,196	15,746,415,225	15,552,143,225	15,553,386,225	+3,080,407,029	-193,029,000
						+1,243,000

TITLE V—DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

Aircraft and related procurement.....	\$7,292,000,000	\$11,717,000,000	\$11,215,800,000	\$11,215,800,000	+ \$3,923,800,000	—\$501,200,000	-----
Major procurement other than aircraft.....	1,610,007,000	1,800,000,000	1,750,000,000	1,800,000,000	+189,993,000	-----	+ \$50,000,000
Acquisition and construction of real property.....	1,448,148,000	1,187,300,000	85,000,000	187,300,000	—1,260,848,000	-----	+102,300,000
Maintenance and operations.....	3,024,218,000	3,238,700,000	3,208,442,000	3,208,442,000	+184,224,000	—30,258,000	-----
Military personnel requirement.....	1,935,500,000	3,076,700,000	3,016,700,000	3,016,700,000	+1,081,200,000	—60,000,000	-----
Research and development.....	297,611,000	425,000,000	425,000,000	425,000,000	+127,389,000	-----	-----
Reserve personnel requirements.....	39,818,000	23,100,000	17,543,000	19,843,000	—19,975,000	—3,257,000	+2,300,000
Air National Guard.....	103,935,000	87,900,000	87,900,000	87,900,000	—16,035,000	-----	-----
Contingencies.....	39,824,000	40,600,000	40,600,000	40,600,000	+776,000	-----	-----
Total, title V—Department of the Air Force, general.....	15,791,061,000	20,596,300,000	19,846,985,000	20,001,585,000	+4,210,524,000	—594,715,000	+154,600,000
Special accounts:							
Defense production guarantees.....	30,000	135,000	135,000	135,000	+105,000	-----	-----
Preparation for sale or salvage of military property.....	4,900,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	—1,900,000	-----	-----
Replacement of personal property sold.....	6,395,022	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	—2,395,022	-----	-----
Wildlife conservation, etc., Eglin Field Reservation.....	8,000	8,000	8,000	8,000	-----	-----	-----
Total, Department of the Air Force, special account.....	11,333,022	7,143,000	7,143,000	7,143,000	—4,190,022	-----	-----
Total, title V Department of the Air Force, general and special accounts.....	15,802,394,022	20,603,443,000	19,854,128,000	20,008,728,000	+4,206,333,978	—594,715,000	+154,600,000
Total, regular annual appropriations, titles I, II, III, IV, V.....	48,205,247,443	57,679,625,700	56,034,717,200	61,103,856,030	+12,898,608,587	+3,424,230,330	+5,069,138,830
Total, general and special appropriations, titles I, II, III, IV, V.....	48,239,322,924	57,707,314,300	56,062,405,890	61,131,544,720	+12,892,221,796	+3,424,230,330	+5,069,138,830

¹ Includes \$102,300,000 contained in H. Doc. 185 and not yet considered by House.

Calendar No. 689

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 5054

[Report No. 730]

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

AUGUST 10 (legislative day, AUGUST 1), 1951

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations

SEPTEMBER 7 (legislative day, SEPTEMBER 4), 1951

Reported by Mr. O'MAHONEY, with amendments

[Omit the part struck through and insert the part printed in italic]

AN ACT

Making appropriations for the National Security Council, the National Security Resources Board, and for military functions administered by the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money
4 in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the National
5 Security Council, the National Security Resources Board,
6 and for military functions administered by the Department
7 of Defense, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending
8 June 30, 1952, namely:

TITLE I

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the National Security Council, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates not in excess of \$50 per diem for individuals; acceptance and utilization of voluntary and uncompensated services; and expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with work related to the activity of the Council; \$160,000.

NATIONAL SECURITY RESOURCES BOARD

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the National Security Resources Board; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates for individuals not in excess of \$50 per diem and contracts with temporary or part-time employees may be renewed annually; expenses of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the work of the National Security Resources Board; hire of passenger motor vehicles; reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services for protection of confidential files; not to exceed \$8,000 for newspapers and periodicals; and not to exceed \$10,000 for emergency and extraordinary expenses, to be expended under the direction of the Chairman for such purposes as he deems proper, and his determination thereon shall be final and conclusive; \$1,600,000.

1 DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

2 MILITARY FUNCTIONS

3 TITLE II

4 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

5 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

6 For expenses necessary for the Office of the Secretary
7 of Defense, the Armed Forces Policy Council, the Joint
8 Chiefs of Staff and the Joint Staff, the Munitions Board, and
9 the Research and Development Board, including purchase
10 (not to exceed five for replacement only, including one at not
11 to exceed \$4,500) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; and
12 not to exceed \$60,000 for emergency and extraordinary ex-
13 penses, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of
14 Defense for such purposes as he deems proper, and his deter-
15 mination thereon shall be final and conclusive; ~~\$13,800,000~~
16 *\$14,450,000.*

17 CLAIMS

18 For payment of claims by the Office of the Secretary
19 of Defense, the Army (except as provided in appropriations
20 for civil functions administered by the Department of the
21 Army), Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force, as authorized
22 by law (5 U. S. C. 946; 28 U. S. C. 2672; 31 U. S. C.
23 222c, 222e, 223b, 223d, 224d; 34 U. S. C. 600; 35 U. S. C.
24 91; 39 U. S. C. 135; 46 U. S. C. 797; Act of November

1 15, 1945, 59 Stat. 582); claims (not to exceed \$1,000
 2 in any one case) for damages to or loss of private property
 3 incident to the operation of Army and Air National Guard
 4 camps of instruction, either during the stay of units of said
 5 organizations at such camps or while en route thereto or
 6 therefrom; claims, as authorized by law, for damage to
 7 property of railroads under training contracts; and repay-
 8 ment of amounts determined by the Secretary of the Army,
 9 the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air
 10 Force, or officers designated by them, to have been erro-
 11 neously collected from military and civilian personnel of the
 12 Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force or from
 13 States, Territories, or the District of Columbia, or members
 14 of National Guard units thereof; \$5,000,000.

15

RETIRED PAY

16 For retired pay and retirement pay, as authorized by law,
 17 of military personnel on the retired lists of the Army, Navy,
 18 Marine Corps, and the Air Force, including the reserve
 19 components thereof; and retainer pay for personnel of the
 20 inactive Fleet Reserve; \$345,000,000: ~~Provided, That no~~
 21 ~~part of such sum shall be used to pay the retired or retire-~~
 22 ~~ment pay of any member of the Regular Army, Navy, Marine~~
 23 ~~Corps, or Air Force who is retired after the date of enact-~~
 24 ~~ment of this Act, unless such member was retired because~~
 25 ~~of (1) being unfit to perform the duties of his office, rank,~~

1 grade, or rating by reason of a physical disability incurred
2 in line of duty, or ~~(2)~~ achieving the age at which retirement
3 is required by law.

4 CONTINGENCIES

5 For emergencies and extraordinary expenses arising in
6 the Department of Defense, to be expended on the approval
7 or authority of the Secretary of Defense and such expenses
8 may be accounted for solely on his certificate that the ex-
9 penditures were necessary for confidential military purposes,
10 \$75,000,000: *Provided*, That a report of disbursements
11 under this item of appropriation shall be made quarterly
12 to the Appropriation Committees of the Congress.

13 EMERGENCY FUND

14 For transfer by the Secretary of Defense, with the ap-
15 proval of the Bureau of the Budget, to any appropriation
16 for military functions under the Department of Defense
17 available for research and development, to be merged with
18 and to be available for the same purposes. and for the same
19 time period, as the appropriation to which transferred,
20 \$90,000,000.

21 NATIONAL EMERGENCY FUND

22 *For transfer by the Secretary of Defense for urgent*
23 *Military requirements, after consultation with the Joint Chiefs*
24 *of Staff and with the approval of the President, to any*
25 *appropriation for military functions under the Department*

1 of Defense, to be expended to expedite the procurement and
2 facility programs of the Department of Defense necessary
3 to provide for an expansion of air power and necessary
4 supporting forces for the United States Air Force and the
5 United States Navy to be merged with and to be available
6 for the same purposes, and for the same time period, as the
7 appropriation to which transferred, \$500,000,000 for ex-
8 penditure during fiscal year 1952 and thereafter and
9 \$4,500,000,000 for expenditure during fiscal year 1953 and
10 thereafter for the purposes authorized in this paragraph:
11 Provided, That the limitation on the availability of any
12 appropriation to which transfers are made hereunder is
13 hereby increased by the amount of any such transfers: Pro-
14 vided further, That a report of transfers proposed under
15 this item shall be made to the Appropriations Committees and
16 the Armed Services Committees of the Congress ten days prior
17 to the actual transfer.

18 DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

19 TITLE III

20 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF THE ARMY

21 CONTINGENCIES OF THE ARMY

22 For emergencies and military expenses arising in
23 the Department of the Army or any of its subordinate
24 bureaus or offices in the District of Columbia, or in the

1 Army at large, but impossible to be anticipated or classified,
2 including personal services; the actual and necessary ex-
3 penses or per diem in lieu thereof, as may be determined
4 and approved by the Secretary of the Army, of military
5 and civilian personnel in and under the Department
6 of the Army on special duty in foreign countries;
7 to be expended on the approval or authority of
8 the Secretary of the Army, and for such purposes
9 as he may deem proper, and his determination thereon
10 shall be final and conclusive upon the accounting officers
11 of the Government and payments from this appropriation
12 may, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Army, be
13 made on his certificate that the expenditures were necessary
14 for confidential military purposes; \$88,000,000.

15 CIVILIAN RELIEF IN KOREA

16 For an additional amount for "Civilian relief in Korea,"
17 \$50,000,000.

18 EXPEDITING PRODUCTION

19 To enable the Secretary of the Army, without reference
20 to section 3734 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and to
21 section 1136 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (except
22 provisions thereof relating to title approval), to expedite
23 the production of equipment and supplies for the Army for
24 emergency national defense purposes, including all of the
25 objects and purposes specified under each of the appropria-

1 tions available to the Department of the Army during the
2 current fiscal year, for procurement or production of
3 equipment or supplies, for erection of structures, or for
4 acquisition of land; the furnishing of Government-owned
5 facilities at privately owned plants; the procurement and
6 training of civilian personnel in connection with the pro-
7 duction of equipment and material and the use and operation
8 thereof, \$1,000,000,000.

9 NATIONAL BOARD FOR PROMOTION OF RIFLE PRACTICE,
10 ARMY

11 For necessary expenses of construction, equipment, and
12 maintenance of rifle ranges, the instruction of citizens in
13 marksmanship, and promotion of rifle practice, in accord-
14 ance with the Act of August 29, 1916 (39 Stat. 643),
15 and the provisions of law contained in 10 U. S. C. 1184-
16 1185 and 32 U. S. C. 181-186, including travel of rifle
17 teams, military personnel and individuals attending regional,
18 national, and international competitions, and not to exceed
19 \$18,000 for incidental expenses of the National Board,
20 \$130,000: *Provided*, That travel expenses of civilian mem-
21 bers of the National Board shall be paid in accordance with
22 the Standardized Government Travel Regulations, as
23 amended.

GENERAL STAFF

FIELD EXERCISES

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, required for the conduct of special field exercises, including participation therein by the National Guard and the Organized Reserves, and including personal services of temporary employees, expenses of troop movements and temporary duty travel of military and civilian personnel, in connection with special field exercises, including special combat training for small units, movement of matériel, maintenance and operation of structures and utilities, rental of land or purchase of options to rent land without reference to section 3648, Revised Statutes, and for use or repair of private property, \$16,000,000.

INTER-AMERICAN RELATIONS, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary of the Army to adopt such measures, appropriate to the functions and activities of the Department of the Army, as he may deem advisable, to promote better relations with the other American countries, including transportation and subsistence expenses, while traveling in the Western Hemisphere, of Army officers and military students of the other American countries and Army officers of the United States, \$388,000.

1 FINANCE CORPS

2 FINANCE SERVICE, ARMY

3 For Finance Service, Army, to be accounted for as one
4 fund, as follows—

5 PAY OF THE ARMY

6 For pay and allowances (except commuted rations for
7 enlisted personnel) of cadets and all other personnel of the
8 Army of the United States on active duty (other than
9 personnel of the Reserve components, including the National
10 Guard, on active duty while undergoing Reserve training) ;
11 pay of civilian employees at military headquarters; interest
12 on soldiers' deposits; payment of life insurance premiums
13 authorized by law; mustering-out payments, as authorized by
14 the "Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944", as amended
15 (38 U. S. C. 691-691g), to persons who were or may be
16 denied such payments because they were discharged from
17 the Army to enter the United States Military Academy or
18 the United States Naval Academy and subsequently were
19 discharged from either Academy because of physical dis-
20 ability; expenses of military courts, boards and commissions;
21 expenses of apprehension and delivery of deserters, escaped
22 military prisoners, and soldiers absent without leave, in-
23 cluding payment of rewards, in the discretion of the Secre-
24 tary of the Army, not exceeding \$25 in any one case, to
25 civil officers and citizens, costs of confinement of military

1 prisoners in nonmilitary facilities, donations of not to exceed
2 \$25 to each civilian prisoner upon each release from an Army
3 prison and each soldier discharged otherwise than honorably
4 upon each release from confinement under court-martial sen-
5 tence, and donations of not to exceed \$10, as authorized by
6 law, to each person discharged for fraudulent enlistment;
7 \$3,297,076,000: *Provided*, That section 212 of the Act of
8 June 30, 1932 (5 U. S. C. 59a), shall not apply to retired
9 military personnel on duty at the United States Soldiers'
10 Home: *Provided further*, That the duties of librarian at the
11 United States Military Academy may be performed by an
12 officer of the Regular Army retired from active service, and
13 detailed on active duty for that purpose: *Provided further*,
14 *That all payments for accrued leave made to enlisted mem-*
15 *bers, discharged for the purpose of immediate reenlistment for*
16 *an indefinite period, at Fort Myer, Virginia, during the*
17 *period April 1, 1949 to September 30, 1949, both dates*
18 *inclusive, are hereby validated notwithstanding the provisions*
19 *of section 4 (c) of the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946, as*
20 *amended by the Act of August 4, 1947 (Public Law 350,*
21 *80th Congress):* *Provided further*, *That where such erro-*
22 *neous payments of accrued leave have been collected by, or*
23 *refunded to, the United States, reimbursement thereof shall*
24 *be effected by the General Accounting Office upon receipt of a*
25 *claim therefor from the said member or that person or persons*

1 *entitled to receive the arrears of pay of such member in ac-*
2 *cordance with the Act of June 30, 1906, as amended, 10*
3 *U. S. C. 868: Provided further, That the Comptroller Gen-*
4 *eral of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to*
5 *allow credit in the accounts of disbursing officers for any*
6 *payments validated hereby;*

7 TRAVEL OF THE ARMY

8 For travel allowances and travel in kind, as authorized
9 by law, for persons traveling in connection with the military
10 activities of the Department of the Army, including rental
11 of camp sites and the local procurement of communication
12 service, fuel, light, water service, and other necessary
13 supplies and services incident to individual or troop move-
14 ments, including transportation of organizational equipment
15 and impedimenta; and for expenses, not otherwise provided
16 for, incident to the transportation of authorized baggage of
17 military and civilian personnel; \$245,000,000: *Provided,*
18 *That other appropriations for the Department of the Army*
19 *shall be charged with such amounts as may be required for*
20 *travel in connection with development, procurement, produc-*
21 *tion, maintenance, or construction activities; and, with such*
22 *exception, no other Army appropriation in this Act shall be*
23 *available for any expense for or incident to travel of personnel*
24 *of the Regular Army or civilian employees under the Depart-*
25 *ment of the Army, except the appropriation "Contingencies*

1 of the Army” and the appropriations for Engineer Service,
 2 Army, the Army National Guard, the Organized Reserves,
 3 the Reserve Officers’ Training Corps, the National Board for
 4 the Promotion of Rifle Practice, and the appropriations
 5 “Special Field Exercises”, and “Inter-American Relations,
 6 Department of the Army”;

7 FINANCE SERVICE

8 For compensation of field personnel of the Finance
 9 Corps, and services incident to financial management activi-
 10 ties not otherwise provided for; payment of exchange fees
 11 and exchange losses incurred by disbursing officers or their
 12 agents; and losses in the accounts of Army disbursing officers
 13 in accordance with the Acts of December 13, 1944 (31
 14 U. S. C. 95a), December 23, 1944 (50 U. S. C. 1705-
 15 1707), and July 26, 1947 (61 Stat. 493) ; \$48,423,000.

16 QUARTERMASTER CORPS

17 QUARTERMASTER SERVICE, ARMY

18 For Quartermaster Service, Army, to be accounted for
 19 as one fund, as follows—

20 WELFARE OF ENLISTED MEN

21 For the equipment and conduct of school, reading, lunch,
 22 and amusement rooms, service clubs, chapels, gymnasiums,
 23 and libraries, including periodicals and other publications
 24 and subscriptions for newspapers, transportation of books
 25 and equipment for these services, rental of films, purchase

1 of slides for and making repairs to moving-picture outfits,
2 and for similar and other recreational purposes at training
3 and mobilization camps now established or which may be
4 hereafter established, including expenses for the entertain-
5 ment and instruction of enlisted personnel, \$20,000,000:
6 *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for the
7 instruction of officers on the same basis as enlisted men.

8 SUBSISTENCE OF THE ARMY

9 For purchase of subsistence supplies for issue as rations
10 to troops, including retired enlisted men when ordered to
11 active duty, civil employees when entitled thereto, hospital
12 matrons, applicants for enlistment while held under obser-
13 vation, general prisoners of war, and general prisoners at
14 posts; ice for issue to organizations of enlisted men and for
15 cooling drinking water and for preservation of stores; sub-
16 sistence of the masters, officers, crews, and employees of Army
17 vessels; meals for recruiting parties and applicants for enlist-
18 ment while under observation; sales to officers, including mem-
19 bers of the Officers' Reserve Corps while on active duty, and
20 enlisted men of the Army; payment of allowances of commu-
21 tation in lieu of rations to enlisted men as authorized by law;
22 commuted rations for enlisted men, applicants for enlistment
23 while held under observation, civilian employees who are
24 entitled to subsistence at public expense, and general

1 prisoners while sick in hospitals, to be paid to the surgeon in
2 charge; advertising; for subsistence of supernumeraries ne-
3 cessitated by emergent military circumstances; prizes to be
4 established by the Secretary of the Army for enlisted men
5 of the Army who graduate from the Army schools for bakers
6 and cooks; and for other necessary expenses incident to the
7 purchase, testing, care, preservation, issue, sale, and
8 accounting for subsistence supplies for the Army; in all,
9 \$603,309,000: *Provided*, That none of the funds appro-
10 priated in this title shall be used for the payment of
11 any subsidy on agricultural or other products: *Provided*
12 *further*, That no part of this or any other appropriation con-
13 tained in this Act shall be available for the procurement
14 of any article of food or clothing not grown or produced in
15 the United States or its possessions, except to the extent
16 that the Secretary of the Department concerned shall deter-
17 mine that a satisfactory quality and sufficient quantity of any
18 articles of food or clothing grown or produced in the United
19 States or its possessions cannot be procured as and when
20 needed at United States market prices and except procure-
21 ments by vessels in foreign waters and emergency procure-
22 ments or procurements of perishable foods by establishments
23 located outside the continental United States, except the
24 Territories of Hawaii and Alaska, for the personnel attached:

1 thereto: *Provided further*, That nothing herein shall preclude
2 the procurement of foods manufactured or processed in the
3 United States or its possessions;

4 REGULAR SUPPLIES OF THE ARMY

5 For supplies, services, and other expenses, not otherwise
6 provided for, incident to the design, development, procure-
7 ment, manufacture, care, protection, alteration, repair, main-
8 tenance, installation, storage and issue of Quartermaster
9 Corps supplies, materials, and equipment (exclusive of fixed
10 installations in buildings otherwise provided for), including
11 petroleum and other products, market reports and personal
12 services; supplies and equipment for troops and general serv-
13 ice schools; operation of field printing plants not otherwise
14 provided for and contract printing and binding; purchase,
15 subsistence, and care of animals required in connection with
16 Army training and other activities; expenses incident to
17 raising and harvesting forage on military reservations, in-
18 cluding, when specifically authorized by the Secretary of
19 the Army, the cost of irrigation; \$465,000,000;

20 CLOTHING AND EQUIPAGE

21 For cloth, woolens, materials, and for the purchase and
22 manufacture of clothing for the Army, including retired
23 enlisted men when ordered to active duty, for issue and for
24 sale; commutation of clothing due enlisted men; altering and

1 fitting clothing and washing and cleaning when necessary,
 2 including laundry work for enlisted men while patients in a
 3 hospital; operation of laundries, existing or now under con-
 4 struction, including purchase and repair of laundry machinery
 5 therefor; authorized issues of articles for use of general
 6 prisoners confined at military posts without pay or allow-
 7 ances, and for applicants for enlistment while held under
 8 observation; equipment and repair of equipment of existing
 9 dry-cleaning plants, salvage and sorting storehouses, hat-
 10 repairing shops, shoe-repair shops, clothing-repair shops,
 11 and garbage-reduction works; equipage; issue of toilet kits
 12 to recruits upon their first enlistment; expenses of packing
 13 and handling and similar necessities; citizens' outer clothing
 14 and an overcoat, when necessary, the cost of all not to
 15 exceed \$30, to be issued each person upon each release
 16 from an Army prison, each soldier discharged otherwise
 17 than honorably, to each enlisted man convicted by civil
 18 court for an offense resulting in confinement in a penitentiary
 19 or other civil prison, and to each enlisted man ordered
 20 interned as an alien enemy, or, for the same reason, dis-
 21 charged without internment; ~~\$1,506,681,000~~ \$1,639,081,-
 22 000: ~~Provided,~~ That none of the funds appropriated in this
 23 or any other Act, and none of the property procured there-

1 with, shall be available for transfer to any working capital
2 fund under the provisions of section 405 (d) of the National
3 Security Act, as amended.

4 INCIDENTAL EXPENSES OF THE ARMY

5 Postage; incidental expenses of recruiting; for activi-
6 ties of chaplains (excluding ritual garments and personal
7 services); for tests and experimental and development
8 work and scientific research, not otherwise provided for,
9 including that to be performed by the Bureau of Standards
10 for the Quartermaster Corps; for inspection service and
11 instruction furnished by the Department of Agriculture
12 which may be transferred in advance; for such additional
13 expenditures as are necessary and authorized by law in the
14 movements and operation of the Army and at military posts,
15 and not expressly assigned to any other departments; for
16 burial of the dead as authorized by Acts of May 17, 1938
17 (10 U. S. C. 916-916d), and July 8, 1940 (5 U. S. C.
18 103a), including remains of personnel of the Army of the
19 United States who die while on active duty, including travel
20 allowances of attendants accompanying remains, communi-
21 cation service, transportation of remains, and acquisition by
22 lease or otherwise of temporary burial sites; ~~\$187,914,000~~
23 *\$194,514,000: Provided, That expenditures of appropri-*
24 *ations contained in this Act for public informational activities*
25 *of the Department of Defense shall not exceed \$10,950,000*

1 *including pay and allowances of military personnel assigned*
 2 *to such activities.*

3 TRANSPORTATION CORPS

4 TRANSPORTATION SERVICE, ARMY

5 For expenses necessary for the transportation of Army
 6 supplies, equipment, funds of the Army, including packing,
 7 crating, and unpacking; maintenance and operation of trans-
 8 portation facilities and installations, including the purchase,
 9 construction, alteration, operation, lease, repair, development,
 10 and maintenance of and research in transportation equipment,
 11 including boats, vessels, and railroad equipment; procure-
 12 ment of supplies and equipment; communication service;
 13 maps, wharfage, tolls, ferriage, drayage, and cartage;
 14 conducting instruction in Army transportation activities;
 15 ~~\$968,515,000~~ \$938,515,000 for expenditure during fiscal
 16 year 1952 and thereafter and \$30,000,000 for expenditure
 17 during fiscal year 1953 and thereafter for the purposes
 18 authorized in this paragraph: *Provided*, That during the
 19 current fiscal year the cost of transportation from point of
 20 origin to the first point of storage or consumption
 21 of supplies, equipment, and material in connection with the
 22 manufacturing and purchasing activities of the Quartermaster
 23 Corps may be charged to the appropriations from which
 24 such supplies, equipment, and material are procured: *Pro-*
 25 *vided further*, That vessels under the jurisdiction of the

1 Department of Commerce, the Department of the Army,
2 the Department of the Air Force, or the Department of
3 the Navy may be transferred or otherwise made available
4 without reimbursement to any of such agencies upon the
5 request of the head of one agency and the approval of the
6 agency having jurisdiction of the vessels concerned.

7 SIGNAL CORPS

8 SIGNAL SERVICE OF THE ARMY

9 Purchase, equipment, operation, installation, and repair
10 of military telegraph, telephone, radio, cable, signaling, and
11 aircraft warning systems; signal equipment and stores,
12 heliographs, signal lanterns, flags, and other necessary in-
13 struments; wind vanes, barometers, anemometers, ther-
14 mometers, and other meteorological instruments; photo-
15 graphic and cinematographic work performed for the Army
16 by the Signal Corps; motor-driven and other vehicles for
17 technical and official purposes in connection with the con-
18 struction, operation, and maintenance of communication or
19 signaling systems, and supplies for their operation and main-
20 tenance; maps for use of the Signal Corps and in the office
21 of the Chief Signal Officer; telephone apparatus, including
22 rental and payment for commercial, exchange, message,
23 trunk-line, long-distance, and leased-line telephone service,
24 excepting telephone service for the various bureaus in the
25 District of Columbia, and the rental of commercial telegraph

1 lines and equipment, and their operation, at or connecting,
2 any Army facility, including payment for official individual
3 telegraph messages transmitted over commercial lines; elec-
4 trical installations and maintenance thereof, electric time
5 service, fire control and direction apparatus, and matériel
6 for Field Artillery; supplies, general repairs, reserve
7 supplies, and other expenses connected with the col-
8 lection and transmitting of information for the Army
9 by telegraph or otherwise; experimental investigation,
10 research, purchase, and development, or improvements
11 in apparatus, and maintenance of signaling and acces-
12 sories thereto, including machines, instruments, and
13 other equipment for laboratory and repair purposes; lease,
14 alteration, and repair of such buildings required for storing
15 or guarding Signal Corps supplies, equipment, and personnel
16 when not otherwise provided for, including the introduction
17 of water, electric light and power, sewerage, grading, roads
18 and walks, and other equipment required; for all expenses,
19 not otherwise provided for, incident to the preparation of
20 plans, and construction, purchase, installation, equipment,
21 maintenance, repair, and operation of aircraft warning service
22 systems, and their accessories, including purchase of lands
23 and rights-of-way, acquisition of leaseholds and other interests
24 therein, and temporary use thereof; \$1,213,707,000
25 \$817,931,000 for expenditure during fiscal year 1952 and

1 thereafter and \$400,000,000 for expenditure during fiscal
2 year 1953 and thereafter for the purposes authorized in this
3 paragraph.

4 ALASKA COMMUNICATION SYSTEM

5 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

6 For expenses necessary for the operation, maintenance,
7 and improvement of the Alaska Communication System, in-
8 cluding purchase (not to exceed one) and hire of passenger
9 motor vehicles, \$4,176,000, to remain available until the
10 close of the fiscal year 1953, and in addition not to exceed
11 15 per centum of the current fiscal year receipts of the
12 Alaska Communication System may be merged with and
13 used for the purposes of this appropriation.

14 CONSTRUCTION

15 For construction, installation, and equipment of tem-
16 porary or permanent public works, including buildings, facili-
17 ties, appurtenances and utilities, at stations of the Alaska
18 Communication System, as authorized by Act of October 27,
19 1949 (Public Law 414), without regard to sections 1136 and
20 3734, Revised Statutes, as amended, including hire of pas-
21 senger motor vehicles; \$1,400,000, to remain available
22 until expended: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall
23 not be available for construction of family quarters at (1)
24 an average cost in excess of \$24,000 for construction,
25 including but not limited to, kitchen range, refrigera-

1 tor, telephone, architectural and engineering services, and
 2 all contingencies; nor at (2) a cost per family unit in excess
 3 of \$5,000, for site development and outside utilities, including
 4 architectural and engineering services therefor and all con-
 5 tingencies.

6 MEDICAL SERVICE

7 MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL DEPARTMENT

8 For the manufacture and purchase of medical and hos-
 9 pital supplies for military posts, camps, hospitals, hospital
 10 ships and transports, and supplies required for mosquito
 11 destruction in and about military posts in the Canal Zone;
 12 operation of the Army Medical Library and Museum under
 13 the direct supervision of the Surgeon General; purchase of
 14 veterinary supplies and hire of veterinary surgeons; expenses
 15 of medical supply depots and maintenance of branch depots;
 16 medical care and treatment of patients when entitled therefo
 17 by law, regulation, or contract, including their care, treat-
 18 ment, and subsistence in private hospitals, whether on duty
 19 or on furlough or on leave of absence except when elective
 20 medical treatment has been obtained by such personnel in
 21 civilian hospitals or from civilian physicians or dentists; medi-
 22 cal care and treatment of authorized personnel of any country
 23 whose defense the President deems vital to the defense of
 24 the United States when such care and treatment cannot be
 25 obtained from medical units of their own country; care and

1 treatment of epidemic and contagious diseases in the Army
2 or at military posts or stations, including measures to prevent
3 the spread thereof; pay of internes; pay of civilian physicians
4 employed to examine physically applicants for enlistment
5 and enlisted men and to render other professional services
6 from time to time under proper authority; payment of ex-
7 press companies and local transfers employed directly by the
8 Medical Service for the transportation of medical and hos-
9 pital supplies, including bidders' samples and water for
10 analysis; supply of Army and Navy Hospital at Hot Springs,
11 Arkansas; advertising, and other necessary miscellaneous
12 expenses of the Medical Service, including tuition and fees
13 of military and civilian personnel at civilian educational
14 institutions; ~~\$269,580,000~~ \$259,580,000 for expenditure
15 during fiscal year 1952 and thereafter and \$10,000,000 for
16 expenditure during fiscal year 1953 and thereafter for the
17 purposes authorized in this paragraph.

18 CORPS OF ENGINEERS

19 ENGINEER SERVICE, ARMY

20 For expenses necessary for the procurement, manu-
21 facture, maintenance, and issue of utilities, engineer sup-
22 plies, materials, and equipment; procurement, preparation,
23 and reproduction of maps and similar data for military
24 purposes; military surveys, engineering planning, and in-

1 vestigation and design; expenses incident to military and
2 training operations, including operation of the Engineer
3 School; travel and transportation; rentals, at the seat of
4 Government or elsewhere, maintenance, installation, alter-
5 ation, repair, protection, and operation of buildings, grounds,
6 and other facilities, including appurtenances thereto; ad-
7 ministration of real estate, acquisition of lands, easements,
8 rights-of-way, or other similar interests in and tempo-
9 rary use of lands, and, in administering the provisions
10 of 43 U. S. C. 315q, rentals may be paid in advance;
11 payment of deficiency judgments and interest thereon arising
12 out of condemnation proceedings; relocation of utilities not
13 otherwise provided for; utility services for buildings erected
14 at private cost, as authorized by law (10 U. S. C. 1346),
15 and buildings on military reservations authorized by Depart-
16 ment of the Army regulations to be used for a similar pur-
17 pose; and expenses of packing, crating, unpacking, and
18 uncrating of supplies, materials, equipment, and baggage
19 not otherwise provided for; ~~\$1,166,049,000~~ \$1,126,049,000
20 *for expenditure during fiscal year 1952 and thereafter and*
21 *\$40,000,000 for expenditure during fiscal year 1953 and*
22 *thereafter for the purposes authorized in this paragraph.*

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY

2 For an additional amount for "Military construction,
3 Army," to remain available until expended, \$48,363,700,
4 for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority
5 heretofore granted under this head to enter into contracts.

ORDNANCE CORPS

ORDNANCE SERVICE AND SUPPLIES, ARMY

8 For manufacture, procurement, storage, and issue, in-
9 cluding research, planning, design, development, inspection,
10 test, alteration, maintenance, repair, and handling of ordnance
11 material and aircraft, together with the machinery, supplies,
12 and services necessary thereto; supplies and services in con-
13 nection with the general work of the Ordnance Corps, com-
14 prising police and office duties, rents, tolls, fuel, light, water,
15 advertising, stationery, typewriting and computing machines,
16 including their exchange, and furniture, tools, and instru-
17 ments of service; instruction, training, and other incidental
18 expenses of the ordnance service; purchase and hire of
19 passenger motor vehicles; ammunition for military salutes
20 at Government establishments and institutions to which the
21 issues of arms for salutes are authorized; services, material,
22 tools, and appliances for operation of the testing machines
23 and chemical laboratory in connection therewith; publica-
24 tions for libraries of the Ordnance Corps, including the
25 Ordnance Office; ~~\$8,307,500,000~~ \$3,332,082,430 for ex-

1 *penditure during fiscal year 1952 and thereafter and \$4,-*
2 *743,974,000 for expenditure during fiscal 1953 and*
3 *thereafter for the purposes authorized in this paragraph.*

4 CHEMICAL CORPS

5 CHEMICAL SERVICE, ARMY

6 For purchase, manufacture, and test of chemical agents
7 and toxic substances, incendiary materials and munitions,
8 gas masks, or other offensive or defensive materials or appli-
9 ances required for chemical purposes, investigations, research,
10 design, experimentation, and operation, purchase of chemi-
11 cals, special scientific and technical apparatus and instru-
12 ments, including services connected therewith; maintenance
13 and repair of plants, buildings, and equipment, and the
14 machinery therefor; receiving, storing, and issuing of sup-
15 plies, comprising police and office duties, rents, tolls, fuels,
16 gasoline, lubricants, paints and oils, rope and cordage, light,
17 water, advertising, stationery, typewriting and computing
18 machines including their exchange, office furniture, tools, and
19 instruments; incidental expenses; libraries of the Chemical
20 Corps; expenses incidental to the organization, training, and
21 equipment of special gas troops not otherwise provided for,
22 including the training of the Army in Chemical Corps activi-
23 ties, both offensive and defensive, together with the necessary
24 schools, tactical demonstrations, and maneuvers; expenses
25 of chemical projectile filling plants and proving grounds, in-

cluding maintenance of rail transportation, repairs, alterations, accessories, building and repairing butts and targets, clearing and grading ranges; ~~\$122,560,000~~ \$102,560,000 for expenditure during fiscal year 1952 and thereafter and \$20,000,000 for expenditure during fiscal year 1953 and thereafter for the purposes authorized in this paragraph.

ARMY TRAINING

For miscellaneous supplies, material, equipment, and services, tuition and other incidental expenses, not otherwise provided for, essential in conducting instruction in service schools and elsewhere; contingencies for the Commandant of the National War College, to be expended in his discretion (not exceeding \$1,000); purchase, repair, and cleaning of uniforms for guards at the National War College; operation of the Office, Chief, Army Field Forces, subordinate commands, installations, and boards, not otherwise provided for, \$22,300,000.

UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION

For text and reference books for instruction; increase and expense of library; office equipment and supplies; stationery, blank books, forms, diplomas for graduates; expense of lectures; apparatus, equipment, supplies, and materials for purpose of instruction and athletics, and maintenance and repair thereof; musical instruments and

1 maintenance of band; care and maintenance of organ;
2 equipment for cadet mess; postage, telephones, and tele-
3 grams; freight and expressage; for commutation of rations
4 to the cadet mess for civilians employed and subsisted at
5 cadet mess in the same amount as deducted from each civil-
6 ian's pay for said rations; expenses, including not to exceed
7 \$95,000 for contingencies, incident to the observance of the
8 Sesquicentennial of the Military Academy; contingencies for
9 Superintendent of the Military Academy (not exceeding
10 \$5,200) and for the Commandant of Cadets (not exceeding
11 \$1,200), to be expended in their respective discretions;
12 expenses of the members of the Board of Visitors (not ex-
13 ceeding \$1,500); contingent fund, to be expended under the
14 direction of the Academic Board (not exceeding \$1,000);
15 improvement, repair, and maintenance of buildings and
16 grounds (including roads, walls, and fences); shooting gal-
17 leries and ranges; cooking, heating, and lighting apparatus
18 and fixtures and operation and maintenance thereof; mainte-
19 nance of water, sewer, and plumbing systems; maintenance of
20 and repairs to cadet camp; fire-extinguishing apparatus; ma-
21 chinery and tools and repairs of same; policing buildings and
22 grounds; furniture, refrigerators, and lockers for Government-
23 owned buildings at the Academy and repair and maintenance
24 thereof; fuel for heat, light, and power; and other necessary
25 incidental expenses in the discretion of the superintendent;

1 in all, \$6,305,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$3,750 of
2 this amount shall be available to liquidate the indebtedness
3 of cadets separated from the service for any reason during
4 their first year, who at the time of their separation are in
5 debt to the Treasurer of the United States Military Academy.

6 CIVILIAN COMPONENTS

7 ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

8 For expenses necessary for equipping, maintaining, op-
9 erating and training the Army National Guard, including
10 expenses of camps, airfields, storage facilities, buildings,
11 structures, rifle ranges, and facilities, the purchase (not
12 to exceed one hundred) and hire of passenger motor vehicles
13 for official use only, and the modification, repair, maintenance
14 and operation of airplanes; transportation of things; personal
15 services in the National Guard Bureau and services of per-
16 sonnel of the Army National Guard employed as civilians
17 (without regard to their military rank) necessary for the
18 care, maintenance, modification and repair of materials and
19 equipment, for Federal property and custodial accounting
20 work, and for administrative and such other duties as may
21 be required; medical and hospital treatment of members
22 of the Army National Guard who suffer injury or con-
23 tract disease in line of duty and other expenses connected
24 therewith as authorized by law; pay at a rate not less than
25 \$2,400 per annum and travel of property and disbursing offi-

1 cers for the United States; travel expenses (other than mile-
2 age), at the same rates as authorized by law for Army
3 National Guard personnel on active Federal duty, of Army
4 National Guard division and regimental commanders while
5 inspecting units in compliance with National Guard regula-
6 tions when specifically authorized by the Chief, National
7 Guard Bureau; attendance of Army National Guard per-
8 sonnel at military service schools; drill pay of the Army
9 National Guard; subsistence for drills of eight or more hours
10 duration in any one calendar day; expenses of temporary
11 duty travel of personnel of the Regular Army in connection
12 with activities of the Army National Guard; procurement
13 and issue to the Army National Guard of the several States,
14 Territories, and the District of Columbia of military equip-
15 ment and supplies, as provided by law, including motor-
16 propelled vehicles and airplanes; and expenses of repair,
17 modification, issue, maintenance and use of supplies, material
18 and equipment, and such property may be furnished from
19 Army stocks without reimbursement subject to recall for
20 Army requirements; \$202,982,000, to remain available
21 until June 30, 1953: *Provided*, That the number of care-
22 takers authorized to be employed for any one unit or pool
23 under the provisions of section 90 of the National Defense
24 Act of June 3, 1916, as amended, may be such as is deemed
25 necessary by the Secretary of the Army.

1 ORGANIZED RESERVES

2 For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, and trans-
3 portation (including mileage, actual and necessary expenses,
4 or per diem in lieu thereof), and medical and hospital
5 treatment and related expenses, as authorized by law, for
6 personnel of the Organized Reserve Corps while on active
7 duty undergoing Reserve training or while performing drills
8 or equivalent duty; maintenance, operation, rental, repair,
9 and other necessary expenses of facilities for the training
10 and administration of the Organized Reserve Corps; ex-
11 penses of temporary-duty travel in connection with activities
12 of the Organized Reserve Corps; transportation of things;
13 purchase (not to exceed two hundred) and hire of passenger
14 motor vehicles and aircraft; supplies, services, matériel, and
15 equipment, not otherwise provided for, necessary to train and
16 equip the Organized Reserve Corps; and expenses of modifi-
17 cation, issue, maintenance, and use of supplies, matériel, and
18 equipment, which may be furnished without reimbursement
19 from Army stock; \$104,810,000 to remain available until
20 June 30, 1953.

21 ARMY RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS

22 For expenses necessary for the operation of the Reserve
23 Officers' Training Corps, as authorized by law, including
24 procurement, maintenance, transportation, and issue of sup-
25 plies and equipment; pay, subsistence, allowances, trans-

1 portation (including mileage), and medical and hospital
2 treatment and related expenses for members of the Reserve
3 Officers' Training Corps as authorized by law; hire of
4 passenger motor vehicles; maintenance and operation of
5 facilities; establishment and maintenance of camps; cleaning
6 and laundering of uniforms and clothing at camps; expenses
7 of temporary duty travel in connection with activities of
8 the Reserve Officers' Training Corps; expenses for institu-
9 tions as authorized by section 1225, Revised Statutes, as
10 amended, and section 55c of the National Defense Act, as
11 amended (34 U. S. C. 1129; 10 U. S. C. 1180, 1181);
12 expenses of modification, issue, maintenance, and use of
13 supplies, materials, and equipment, which may be furnished
14 without reimbursement from Army stocks; to remain avail-
15 able until June 30, 1953, \$27,141,000.

16 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY CIVILIAN COMPONENTS.

17 For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation
18 and conversion of facilities for the training and administration
19 of the reserve components, including contributions therefor,
20 as authorized by the Act of September 11, 1950 (64 Stat.
21 829), without regard to sections 1136 and 3734, Revised
22 Statutes, as amended, and land and interests therein may be
23 acquired and construction prosecuted thereon prior to the
24 approval of title by the Attorney General as required by

1 section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; hire of
 2 passenger motor vehicles; \$24,000,000, to remain available
 3 until expended.

4 DEPARTMENTAL SALARIES AND EXPENSES

5 SALARIES, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

6 For compensation for personal services in the Depart-
 7 ment of the Army proper, to be accounted for as one fund,
 8 as follows:

9 Office of Secretary of the Army: Secretary of the Army,
 10 Under Secretary of the Army, Assistant Secretaries of the
 11 Army, and other personal services, ~~\$3,625,000~~ \$3,723,400.

12 Office of Chief of Staff, \$9,500,000;

13 Adjutant General's Office, \$16,500,000;

14 Office of the Inspector General, \$259,000;

15 Office of the Judge Advocate General, ~~\$700,000~~
 16 \$743,000;

17 Office of the Chief of Finance, \$1,540,500;

18 Office of the Quartermaster General, ~~\$9,625,000~~ \$9,-
 19 875,000;

20 Office of the Chief of Transportation, ~~\$3,800,000~~
 21 \$4,024,000;

22 Office of the Chief Signal Officer, \$3,750,000;

23 Office of the Provost Marshal General, \$245,000;

24 Office of the Surgeon General, \$3,100,000;

25 Office of Chief of Engineers, \$5,400,000;

1 Office of Chief of Ordnance, ~~\$6,500,000~~ \$6,750,000;
2 Office of Chief, Chemical Corps, \$1,500,000;
3 Office of Chief of Chaplains, \$170,000.

4 CONTINGENT EXPENSES, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

5 For miscellaneous expenses at the seat of government,
6 \$30,000,000.

7 DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

8 TITLE IV

9 MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY

10 For pay, allowances, subsistence, interest on deposits,
11 gratuities, clothing, permanent change of station travel (in-
12 cluding expenses of temporary duty between permanent duty
13 stations), and transportation of dependents, as authorized
14 by law, for regular and reserve personnel on active duty
15 (except those on active duty while undergoing reserve
16 training), \$2,456,475,000.

17 MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVAL RESERVE

18 For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities,
19 and travel, as authorized by law, for personnel of the Naval
20 Reserve on active duty while undergoing reserve training,
21 or while performing drills or equivalent duty \$62,718,000.

22 MILITARY PERSONNEL, OFFICER CANDIDATES

23 For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, and
24 travel, as authorized by law, for officer candidates,

1 including midshipmen at the Naval Academy, aviation
2 midshipmen, aviation cadets, regular and contract enrollees
3 in the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and Reserve
4 officer candidates; and retainer pay authorized by the Act of
5 August 13, 1946 (34 U. S. C. 1020h), to remain available
6 until June 30, 1953; \$19,348,000.

7 NAVY PERSONNEL, GENERAL EXPENSES

8 For expenses necessary for general training, education
9 and administration of regular and reserve personnel, includ-
10 ing tuition, cash book allowances of not to exceed \$50 for
11 each Naval Aviation College program student, and other
12 costs incurred at civilian schools, general training aids and
13 devices, procurement of military personnel, and authorized
14 annuity premiums and retirement benefits for civilian mem-
15 bers of teaching staffs; maintenance and operation of Navy
16 training and personnel facilities, including the Naval Acad-
17 emy, Naval Postgraduate School, Naval War College, Naval
18 Home, Navy training schools and facilities, disciplinary
19 barracks, and retraining commands; rent; hire of motor
20 vehicles; not to exceed \$30 per person for civilian clothing,
21 including an overcoat when necessary, for enlisted person-
22 nel discharged otherwise than honorably; welfare and recre-
23 ation; medals and other awards; research and development;
24 and departmental salaries; \$97,570,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For pay, allowances, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, clothing, permanent change of station travel (including expenses of temporary duty between permanent duty stations), and transportation of dependents, as authorized by law, for regular and reserve personnel on active duty (except those on active duty while undergoing reserve training), \$565,459,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS RESERVE

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, and travel, as authorized by law, for personnel of the Marine Corps Reserve and the Marine Corps platoon leaders class on active duty while undergoing reserve training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty, \$15,145,000.

MARINE CORPS TROOPS AND FACILITIES

For necessary expenses of troops and facilities of the Marine Corps not otherwise provided for, including maintenance and operation of equipment and facilities, and procurement of military personnel; training and education of regular and reserve personnel, including tuition and other costs incurred at civilian schools; welfare and recreation; not to exceed \$30 per person for civilian clothing, including an overcoat when necessary, for enlisted personnel discharged otherwise than honorably; research and develop-

1 ment; procurement and manufacture of ordnance, ammuni-
2 tion, and other military supplies, equipment and clothing;
3 purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles; transporta-
4 tion of things; industrial mobilization; rent; medals, awards,
5 emblems and other insignia; care of the dead; and depart-
6 mental salaries; \$1,018,120,000.

7 AIRCRAFT AND FACILITIES

8 For expenses necessary for maintenance, operation, and
9 modification of aircraft; maintenance, operation, and lease
10 of air stations and facilities, testing laboratories, fleet and
11 other aviation activities; procurement of services, supplies,
12 special clothing, tools, materials, and equipment, including
13 rescue boats; research and development; industrial mobiliza-
14 tion; aerological services, supplies, and equipment for the
15 Navy and Marine Corps; and departmental salaries; \$923,-
16 393,000: *Provided*, That the unexpended balance of the
17 appropriation for "Aviation, Navy, 1949" shall remain
18 available until June 30, 1952, for the liquidation of con-
19 tract obligations incurred thereunder during the fiscal year
20 1949 for aircraft equipment and research and development.

21 CONSTRUCTION OF AIRCRAFT AND RELATED

22 PROCUREMENT

23 For construction, procurement, and modernization of
24 aircraft and equipment, including ordnance, spare parts, and
25 accessories therefor; expansion of public and not to ex-

1 ceed \$100,000,000 for expansion of private plants, includ-
 2 ing the land necessary therefor, without regard to section
 3 3734, Revised Statutes, as amended, and such land, and
 4 interests therein, may be acquired and construction pros-
 5 ecuted thereon prior to approval of title by the Attorney
 6 General as required by section 355, Revised Statutes, as
 7 amended; procurement and installation of equipment in public
 8 or private plants; and departmental salaries necessary for
 9 the purposes of this appropriation, to remain available until
 10 expended, ~~\$4,000,000,000~~ *\$1,050,000,000 for expenditure*
 11 *during fiscal year 1952 and thereafter and \$2,950,000,000*
 12 *for expenditure during fiscal year 1953 and thereafter for*
 13 *the purposes authorized in this paragraph*, of which \$450,-
 14 000,000 of the *\$1,050,000,000* is for liquidation of obliga-
 15 tions incurred under authority heretofore granted to enter
 16 into contracts for the foregoing purposes.

17 SHIPS AND FACILITIES

18 For expenses necessary for design, maintenance, opera-
 19 tion, and alteration of vessels; maintenance and operation of
 20 facilities; procurement of plant equipment, appliances, and
 21 machine tools, and installation thereof in public or private
 22 plants; procurement of equipment, supplies, special clothing
 23 and services, including subsistence and other expenses of
 24 civilian crews of vessels: installation, maintenance, and re-
 25 moval of ships' ordnance; lease of facilities and docks:

1 charter and hire of vessels; relief of vessels in distress; mari-
 2 time salvage services; research and development; industrial
 3 mobilization; and departmental salaries; \$1,537,452,000.

4 CONSTRUCTION OF SHIPS

5 For an additional amount for "Construction of Ships,"
 6 to remain available until expended, \$77,353,000, of which
 7 \$55,961,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred pur-
 8 suant to authority heretofore granted under this head:
 9 *Provided*, That the total of obligations incurred under this
 10 head for construction, conversion, or replacement, approved
 11 after July 17, 1947, shall not exceed \$1,085,663,000.

12 SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION

13 For expenses necessary for the construction, acquisition,
 14 or conversion of vessels as authorized by the Act of March
 15 10, 1951 (Public Law 3), or otherwise authorized by law,
 16 including plant equipment, appliances, and machine tools,
 17 and installation thereof in public or private plants, and de-
 18 partmental salaries necessary for the purposes of this appro-
 19 priation, ~~\$1,343,297,000~~ \$245,040,000 for expenditure dur-
 20 ing fiscal year 1952 and thereafter and \$1,098,257,000 for
 21 expenditure during fiscal year 1953 and thereafter for the
 22 purposes authorized in this paragraph, to remain available
 23 until expended: *Provided*, That the amount heretofore
 24 appropriated under the head "Construction of ships" for the
 25 purposes of the Act of March 10, 1951, is hereby trans-

1 ferred to and merged with this appropriation: *Provided fur-*
2 *ther*, That the total of obligations incurred for the foregoing
3 purposes shall not exceed \$1,480,297,000.

4 ORDNANCE AND FACILITIES

5 For expenses necessary for the production and procure-
6 ment of Navy ordnance and ammunition (except ordnance
7 for new aircraft, new ships, and ships authorized for con-
8 version) ; alteration, preservation, and handling of ordnance
9 and ammunition; maintenance of ordnance (except installa-
10 tion, maintenance, and removal of ships' ordnance, and line
11 maintenance of ordnance installed in aircraft) ; maintenance
12 and operation of ordnance facilities; procurement of equip-
13 ment, supplies, special clothing and services; procurement of
14 plant equipment, appliances, and machine tools, and installa-
15 tion thereof in naval or private plants; lease of facilities;
16 research and development; industrial mobilization; and de-
17 partmental salaries; \$1,335,668,000.

18 ORDNANCE FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION

19 For an additional amount for "Ordnance for new con-
20 struction," to remain available until expended, \$52,445,000,
21 for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority
22 heretofore granted under this head.

23 ORDNANCE FOR SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION

24 For expenses necessary for the construction and pro-
25 curement of armor and armament for vessels provided for in

1 the appropriation "Shipbuilding and conversion," including
 2 plant equipment, appliances, and machine tools, and instal-
 3 lation thereof in public or private plants, and departmental
 4 salaries necessary for the purposes of this appropriation,
 5 ~~\$431,390,000~~ \$75,000,000 for expenditure during fiscal
 6 year 1952 and thereafter and \$356,390,000 for expenditure
 7 during fiscal year 1953 and thereafter for the purposes au-
 8 thorized in this paragraph, to remain available until ex-
 9 pended: *Provided*, That the total of obligations incurred
 10 under this head shall not exceed \$431,390,000.

11 INCREASE AND REPLACEMENT OF NAVAL VESSELS
 12 CONSTRUCTION AND MACHINERY

13 For an additional amount for "Construction and
 14 machinery", including, during the current fiscal year, per-
 15 sonal services in the Bureau of Ships necessary for the pur-
 16 poses of this appropriation, \$45,000,000.

17 ARMOR, ARMAMENT, AND AMMUNITION

18 For an additional amount for "Armor, armament, and
 19 ammunition," including, during the current fiscal year, per-
 20 sonal services in the Bureau of Ordnance necessary for the
 21 purposes of this appropriation, \$12,656,000.

22 MEDICAL CARE

23 For expenses necessary for maintenance and operation
 24 of naval hospitals, medical centers, clinics, schools, research
 25 facilities, the medical supply system, and other medical

1 activities; procurement of ambulances, medical and dental
 2 supplies, equipment and services; rent; instruction of medical
 3 personnel in naval hospitals, naval medical schools, and
 4 civilian schools; research and development; industrial mo-
 5 bilization; care of the dead; and departmental salaries;
 6 \$135,770,000.

7 CIVIL ENGINEERING

8 For expenses necessary for maintenance and operation
 9 of district public works offices, public works centers, advance
 10 base depots, construction battalion centers, defense housing
 11 projects, other civil engineering facilities, and shore activities
 12 not otherwise provided for; procurement of services, supplies
 13 and equipment for the foregoing activities; purchase and
 14 hire of passenger motor vehicles; research and development;
 15 engineering services; industrial mobilization; and depart-
 16 mental salaries; \$196,488,000.

17 PUBLIC WORKS

18 For an additional amount for "Public works", to remain
 19 available until expended, ~~\$50,414,000~~ \$51,657,000, of which
 20 \$1,243,000 shall be used for construction, installation, or re-
 21 pair of sewage facilities at the naval base, Newport, Rhode
 22 Island, and the remainder shall be available for liquidation
 23 of obligations incurred pursuant to authority heretofore
 24 granted under this head to enter into contracts.

FACILITIES

1
2 For expenses necessary for acquisition, construction, and
3 installation of production facilities and equipment, and test
4 facilities and equipment (other than those for research and
5 development), including the land necessary therefor, with-
6 out regard to section 3734, Revised Statutes, as amended,
7 and such land, and interests therein, may be acquired and
8 construction prosecuted thereon prior to the approval of title
9 by the Attorney General as required by section 355, Revised
10 Statutes, as amended, such amounts as may be determined by
11 the Secretary of the Navy, and approved by the Secretary of
12 Defense and the Bureau of the Budget, and said amounts
13 shall be derived by transfer from any appropriations avail-
14 able to the Department of the Navy, during the fiscal year
15 1952, for procurement of equipment for installation or use
16 in private plants: *Provided*, That the total amount so trans-
17 ferred shall not exceed \$100,000,000.

RESEARCH

18
19 For conduct and encouragement of research and develop-
20 ment, not otherwise provided for; dissemination of scientific
21 information; administration of patents, trade-marks, and
22 copyrights; maintenance and operation of research and de-
23 velopment facilities; development, installation, and main-
24 tenance of special devices (including specialized housing
25 therefor); procurement of supplies, services, and equipment;
26 departmental salaries; and other expenses necessary in carry-

1 ing out the Act of August 1, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 475), to
2 remain available until expended, \$69,698,000.

3 SERVICE-WIDE SUPPLY AND FINANCE

4 For expenses necessary for maintenance and operation
5 of service-wide supply and finance activities, including supply
6 depots and centers, clothing depots, market and purchasing
7 offices, supply demand control points, fleet fueling facilities,
8 overseas air cargo terminals, regional accounting and dis-
9 bursing offices, the material catalog office, the cost inspection
10 service, and other service-wide supply and finance facilities,
11 as designated by the Secretary; procurement of supplies,
12 services, special clothing, and equipment; rent; intra-Navy
13 transportation of things, all transportation of Navy stock
14 fund material, and transportation of household effects; re-
15 search and development; industrial mobilization; losses in
16 exchange and in the accounts of disbursing officers, as au-
17 thorized by law; and departmental salaries; \$485,102,000.

18 NAVY STOCK FUND

19 For additional working capital for the Navy stock fund,
20 established pursuant to the National Security Act Amend-
21 ments of 1949, \$450,000,000.

22 SERVICE-WIDE OPERATIONS

23 For expenses necessary for maintenance and operation
24 of the Naval Observatory, the Hydrographic Office, Service-
25 wide Communications, Naval Records Centers, Naval Dis-
26 trict Headquarters (except training and public works

1 offices), River Commands, and other service-wide operations
2 and functions not otherwise provided for; procurement of
3 supplies, services and equipment for activities financed
4 hereunder; Latin-American cooperation; not to exceed
5 \$42,127,000 for emergencies and extraordinary expenses,
6 as authorized by section 6 of the Act of August 2, 1946
7 (5 U. S. C. 419c), to be expended on the approval and
8 authority of the Secretary, and his determination shall be
9 final and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the
10 Government; and departmental salaries; \$150,779,000.

11 OPERATION AND CONSERVATION OF NAVAL PETROLEUM

12 RESERVES

13 For expenses necessary for exploration, prospecting, con-
14 servation, development, use, and operation of the naval
15 petroleum reserves, as authorized by law, \$11,908,000.

16 DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

17 TITLE V

18 AIRCRAFT AND RELATED PROCUREMENT

19 For construction, procurement, and modification of air-
20 craft and equipment, armor and armament, spare parts and
21 accessories therefor; specialized equipment; expansion of
22 public and private plants, Government-owned equipment
23 and installation thereof in such plants, erection of structures,
24 and acquisition of land without regard to section 1136, Re-
25 vised Statutes, as amended, for the foregoing and other pur-

1 poses, and such land, and interests therein, may be acquired
 2 and construction prosecuted thereon prior to the approval
 3 of title by the Attorney General as required by section
 4 355, Revised Statutes, as amended; industrial mobilization,
 5 including maintenance of reserve plants and equipment and
 6 procurement planning; and other expenses necessary for
 7 the foregoing purposes, including rents and transportation
 8 of things; to remain available until expended; ~~\$11,215,-~~
 9 ~~800,000~~ *\$3,215,800,000 for expenditure during fiscal year*
 10 *1952 and thereafter and \$8,000,000,000 for expenditure*
 11 *during fiscal year 1953 and thereafter for the purposes*
 12 *authorized in this paragraph, of which \$625,000,000 of*
 13 *the \$3,215,800,000 is for payment of obligations in-*
 14 *curred under authority heretofore granted to enter into*
 15 *contracts for the foregoing purposes: Provided, That the*
 16 *unexpended balances of the appropriations granted under the*
 17 *head "Air Corps, Army," 1948, and "General expenses,*
 18 *U. S. Air Force," 1949, shall remain available until June*
 19 *30, 1952, for the payment of obligations incurred thereunder*
 20 *prior to July 1, 1948, and July 1, 1949, respectively.*

21 MAJOR PROCUREMENT OTHER THAN AIRCRAFT

22 For procurement of supplies, materials, and equipment,
 23 and spare parts therefor, not otherwise provided for; elec-
 24 tronic and communication equipment; and the purchase of
 25 passenger motor vehicles, ~~\$1,750,000,000~~ *\$1,000,000,000*

1 *for expenditure during fiscal year 1952 and thereafter and*
 2 *\$800,000,000 for expenditure during fiscal year 1953 and*
 3 *thereafter for the purposes authorized in this paragraph, to*
 4 *remain available until expended.*

5 ACQUISITION AND CONSTRUCTION OF REAL PROPERTY

6 *For an additional amount for “Acquisition and construc-*
 7 *tion of real property”, to remain available until expended,*
 8 *\$85,000,000, for payment of obligations incurred under*
 9 *authority heretofore granted under this head to enter into*
 10 *contracts.*

11 *For the continuation of the construction of four classified*
 12 *projects authorized by Public Law 910, Eighty-first Congress,*
 13 *approved January 6, 1951, and Public Law 43, Eighty-*
 14 *second Congress, approved May 31, 1951, to remain avail-*
 15 *able until expended, \$187,300,000 of which \$85,000,000 is*
 16 *for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority*
 17 *heretofore granted under this heading to enter into contracts.*

18 MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION

19 *For expenses necessary for the maintenance, operation,*
 20 *and administration of the activities of the Air Force, includ-*
 21 *ing the United States Air Force Reserve and the Air Re-*
 22 *serve Officers’ Training Corps; maintenance, operation, and*
 23 *modification of aircraft; transportation of things; rents at the*
 24 *seat of government and elsewhere, and in administering the*
 25 *provisions of 43 U. S. C. 315q payments of rents may be*

1 made in advance; repair of facilities; field printing plants;
2 procurement of ambulances; hire of passenger motor vehicles;
3 training and instruction of military and civilian personnel of
4 the Air Force, including tuition and related expenses; pay,
5 allowances and travel expenses of contract surgeons; utility
6 services for buildings erected at private cost as authorized
7 by law (10 U. S. C. 1346), and buildings on military res-
8 ervations authorized by Air Force regulations to be used for
9 welfare and recreational purposes; rental of land or pur-
10 chase of options to rent land without reference to section
11 3648, Revised Statutes, as amended, use or repair of private
12 property, and other necessary expenses of combat maneuvers;
13 organizational clothing and equipage; payment of exchange
14 fees and exchange losses incurred by Air Force disbursing
15 officers or their agents; losses in the accounts of Air Force
16 disbursing officers as authorized by law (31 U. S. C. 95a;
17 50 U. S. C. 1705-1707; Act of July 26, 1947, Public Law
18 248) ; burial of the dead as authorized by law (10 U. S. C.
19 916-916d; 5 U. S. C. 103a), including remains of person-
20 nel of the Air Force of the United States who die while on
21 active duty, travel allowances of attendants accompanying
22 remains, and acquisition by lease or otherwise of temporary
23 burial sites; conduct of schoolrooms, service clubs, chapels,
24 and other instructional, entertainment, and welfare expenses
25 for enlisted men, not otherwise provided for; expenses for

1 inter-American cooperation as authorized for the Navy by
2 the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 421f), for Latin-
3 American cooperation; payments of deficiency judgments and
4 interests thereon arising out of condemnation proceedings
5 heretofore instituted; and special services by contract or
6 otherwise; \$3,208,442,000.

7 MILITARY PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS

8 For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, transportation,
9 interest on deposits of enlisted personnel, and travel in kind
10 for cadets and all other personnel of the Air Force of the
11 United States on active duty (other than personnel of the
12 Reserve components, including the Air National Guard,
13 on active duty while undergoing reserve training), in-
14 cluding commutation of quarters, subsistence supplies for
15 issue as rations to enlisted personnel, cloth and materials and
16 clothing for issue and sale, and clothing allowances, as
17 authorized by law; and, in connection with personnel paid
18 from this appropriation, for rental of camp sites and local
19 procurement of utility services and other necessary expenses
20 incident to individual or troop movements (including pack-
21 ing and unpacking and transportation of organizational equip-
22 ment), ice, meals for recruiting parties, monetary allowances
23 for liquid coffee for troops when supplied cooked or travel
24 rations, altering and fitting clothing, and commutation of
25 rations, as authorized by law, to enlisted personnel, including

1 those sick in hospitals (to be paid to the surgeon in charge) ;
2 transportation, as authorized by law, of dependents, baggage,
3 and household effects of personnel paid from this appropria-
4 tion ; rations for civilian employees when entitled thereto, appli-
5 cants for enlistment, prisoners of war, and general prisoners ;
6 subsistence supplies for resale, as authorized by law ; commu-
7 tation of rations, as authorized by regulations, to applicants
8 for enlistment, civilian employees entitled to subsistence at
9 public expense, and general prisoners, while sick in hospitals
10 (to be paid to the surgeon in charge) ; subsistence of super-
11 numeraries necessitated by emergent military circumstances ;
12 issues of toilet articles and barbers' and tailors' material to
13 general prisoners confined at military posts without pay and
14 allowances, applicants for enlistment, and recruits upon first
15 enlistment ; civilian clothing and when necessary an overcoat,
16 the cost of all not to exceed \$30, for each person upon each
17 release from a military prison, each enlisted man discharged
18 otherwise than honorably, each enlisted man convicted by a
19 civil court for an offense resulting in confinement in a civil
20 prison, and each enlisted man interned, or discharged with-
21 out internment as an alien enemy ; expenses of apprehension
22 and delivery of deserters, stragglers, and escaped military
23 prisoners ; payment, in the discretion of the Secretary, of
24 rewards (not to exceed \$25 in any one case) for the appre-
25 hension of deserters ; confinement of military prisoners in

1 nonmilitary facilities; donations of not to exceed \$25 to each
2 civilian prisoner upon each release from a military prison, to
3 each enlisted man discharged otherwise than honorably upon
4 each release from confinement under court-martial sentence,
5 and to each person discharged for fraudulent enlistment;
6 expenses of courts, boards, and commissions; welfare; and
7 medals and other awards; \$3,016,700,000.

8 RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

9 For expenses necessary for basic and applied scientific
10 research and development, by contract or otherwise, and
11 transportation of things, to remain available until expended,
12 ~~\$425,000,000~~ \$225,000,000 for expenditure during fiscal
13 year 1952 and thereafter and \$200,000,000 for expenditure
14 during fiscal year 1953 and thereafter for the purposes
15 authorized in this paragraph.

16 RESERVE PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS

17 For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, and travel for
18 personnel of the United States Air Force Reserve and the
19 Air Reserve Officers' Training Corps, while on active duty
20 undergoing reserve training or while performing drills or
21 equivalent duty, or undergoing training and instruction *or*
22 *on duty under section 5, National Defense Act, as authorized*
23 *by law*; and the procurement and issue of uniforms to in-
24 stitutions necessary for the training of the Air Reserve
25 Officers' Training Corps, as authorized by law, ~~\$17,543,000~~

1 \$19,843,000 to remain available until June 30, 1953.

2 AIR NATIONAL GUARD

3 For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, transportation
4 (including mileage, actual and necessary expenses, or per
5 diem in lieu thereof), medical and hospital treatment and
6 related expenses, for members of the Air National Guard
7 while undergoing Reserve training or while performing drills
8 or equivalent duty, including officers on duty under section 5,
9 National Defense Act, as authorized by law; travel expenses
10 (other than mileage), on the same basis as authorized by law
11 for Air National Guard personnel on active Federal duty, of
12 Air National Guard commanders while inspecting units in
13 compliance with National Guard regulations when specifically
14 authorized by the Chief, National Guard Bureau; establish-
15 ment, maintenance, operation, repair, and other necessary
16 expenses of facilities for the training and administration of the
17 Air National Guard, including construction of facilities, and
18 additions, extensions, alterations, improvements, and rehabili-
19 tation of existing facilities, as authorized by the Act of
20 September 11, 1950 (Public Law 783); maintenance, oper-
21 ation, and modification of aircraft; transportation of things;
22 purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles; procurement
23 and issue to the Air National Guard of the several
24 States, Territories, and the District of Columbia of
25 supplies, materials, and equipment, as authorized by law;

1 and expenses incident to the maintenance and use of
2 supplies, materials, and equipment, including such as
3 may be furnished from stocks under the control of
4 agencies of the Department of Defense; \$87,900,000:
5 *Provided*, That the number of caretakers authorized
6 to be employed under the provisions of law (32 U. S. C.
7 42) may be such as is deemed necessary by the Secretary of
8 the Air Force.

9 CONTINGENCIES

10 For emergencies and military expenses, to be expended
11 on the authority or approval of the Secretary of the Air
12 Force, and such expenses may be accounted for solely on
13 his certificate, \$40,600,000.

14 TITLE VI—GENERAL PROVISIONS

15 SEC. 601. During the current fiscal year, the Secretary
16 of Defense and the Secretaries of the Air Force, Army, and
17 Navy, respectively, if they should deem it advantageous
18 to the national defense, and if in their opinions the existing
19 facilities of the Department of Defense are inadequate, are
20 authorized to procure services in accordance with section 15
21 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), but at rates
22 for individuals not in excess of \$50 per day, and to pay in
23 connection therewith travel expenses of individuals, including
24 actual transportation and per diem in lieu of subsistence while
25 traveling from their homes or places of business to official

1 duty station and return as may be authorized by law: *Pro-*
2 *vided*, That such contracts may be renewed annually.

3 SEC. 602. Section 3648, Revised Statutes, shall not
4 apply, in the case of payments made from appropriations con-
5 tained in this Act, (1) to payments made in compliance
6 with the laws of foreign countries or their ministerial regula-
7 tions, (2) to payments for rent in such countries for such
8 periods as may be necessary to accord with local custom,
9 or (3) to payments made for tuition.

10 SEC. 603. During the current fiscal year, provisions of
11 law prohibiting the payment of compensation to, or employ-
12 ment of, any person not a citizen of the United States shall
13 not apply to personnel of the Department of Defense.

14 SEC. 604. (a) No part of any appropriation contained in
15 this Act for "Pay and allowances" of military personnel
16 shall be used for any other purpose.

17 ~~(b) No part of any appropriation contained in this~~
18 ~~Act for "Pay and allowances" of military personnel shall~~
19 ~~be expended for the pay or allowances, accruing after No-~~
20 ~~vember 30, 1951, of any member of the inactive or volunteer~~
21 ~~reserve who served on active duty for a period of twelve~~
22 ~~months or more in any branch of the Armed Forces during~~
23 ~~the period beginning December 7, 1941, and ending Sep-~~
24 ~~tember 2, 1945, if such member shall have served on active~~
25 ~~duty for a period of twelve months or more after June 26,~~

1 1950, unless such member shall have voluntarily consented
2 to remain on active duty.

3 SEC. 605. The appropriations in this Act otherwise
4 available for travel or transportation which are current
5 on date of relief from duty station of personnel travel-
6 ing under orders may be charged with all expenses in
7 connection with such travel including transportation of de-
8 pendants and household goods, regardless of time of arrival
9 at destination of such personnel.

10 SEC. 606. Appropriations contained in this Act avail-
11 able for travel shall be available for all expenses incident to
12 attendance at meetings of technical, scientific, professional,
13 or other similar organizations.

14 SEC. 607. No part of any money appropriated in this
15 Act or included under any contract authority granted in
16 this Act shall be expended for the payment of any commis-
17 sion on any land purchase contract in excess of 2 per centum
18 of the purchase price.

19 SEC. 608. Such military and naval personnel as may
20 be detailed for duty with agencies not a part of the Depart-
21 ment of Defense on a reimbursement basis may be employed
22 in addition to the numbers otherwise authorized and appro-
23 priated for.

24 SEC. 609. No collection or reclamation shall be made
25 by the United States on account of any money paid to

1 assignees, transferees, or allottees, or to others for them,
2 under assignments, transfers, or allotments of pay and allow-
3 ances made under authority of law where liability might
4 exist with respect to such assignments, transfers, or allot-
5 ments or the use of such moneys, because of the death of
6 assignors, transferors, or allotters.

7 SEC. 610. Appropriations contained in this Act shall
8 be available for insurance of official motor vehicles in
9 foreign countries, when required by laws of such countries;
10 payments in advance of expenses determined by the investi-
11 gating officer to be necessary and in accord with local custom
12 for conducting investigations in foreign countries incident to
13 matters relating to the activities of the department concerned;
14 reimbursement of General Services Administration for se-
15 curity guard services for protection of confidential files;
16 examination of estimates of appropriations and Department
17 of Defense activities in the field and the use of such appro-
18 priations for such purpose shall be subject only to regulation
19 by the standing committees concerned; and all necessary
20 expenses, at the seat of government of the United States
21 of America or elsewhere, in connection with (1) instruction
22 and training, including tuition, *specifically approved by the*
23 *Secretary of the Department concerned* and not otherwise
24 provided for, of civilian employees, and (2) communica-

1 tion and other services and supplies as may be necessary to
2 carry out the purposes of this Act.

3 SEC. 611. The appropriations contained in this Act
4 for the Air Force, Navy, and for the Army, which
5 are available for the procurement or manufacture of
6 supplies, materials, and equipment of special or technical
7 design may be used for the development and procurement of
8 gages, dies, jigs, and other special aids and appliances, pro-
9 duction studies, factory plans, and other production data,
10 including specifications and detailed drawings, and for the
11 purchase of designs, processes and manufacturing data, copy-
12 rights and letters patent, applications therefor, and licenses
13 thereunder pertaining to such supplies, equipment, and
14 materials for which the appropriations are made.

15 SEC. 612. Any appropriation available to the Air
16 Force, Army, or the Navy may, under such regulations as
17 the Secretary concerned may prescribe, be used for expenses
18 incident to the maintenance, pay, and allowances of prisoners
19 of war, other persons in Air Force, Army, or Navy custody
20 whose status is determined by the Secretary concerned to be
21 similar to prisoners of war, and persons detained in such
22 custody pursuant to Presidential proclamation.

23 SEC. 613. During the current fiscal year, without
24 deposit to the credit of the Treasurer of the United States
25 and withdrawal on money requisitions, receipts of public

1 moneys from sales or other sources by officers of the Depart-
2 ment of Defense on disbursing duty and charged in their
3 official accounts, except receipts to be credited to river and
4 harbor and flood-control appropriations, may be used by them
5 as required for current expenditures, all necessary bookkeep-
6 ing adjustments of appropriations, funds, and accounts to be
7 made in the settlement of their disbursing accounts.

8 SEC. 614. The Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of
9 the Air Force, and the Secretary of the Navy are authorized
10 to expend out of the Appropriations in this Act available for
11 construction or maintenance such amounts as may be required
12 for minor construction (except family quarters), extensions
13 to existing structures, and improvements, at facilities of the
14 Department concerned, but the cost of any project authorized
15 under this section which is not otherwise authorized shall not
16 exceed \$50,000, except that the limitation on the cost of any
17 such project which is determined by the Secretary of Defense
18 to be urgently required in the interests of national defense,
19 shall not exceed \$200,000: *Provided*, That the cost limita-
20 tions of this section shall not apply to amounts authorized to
21 be expended for emergency expenses on the approval of the
22 Secretary concerned.

23 SEC. 615. During the current fiscal year, appropriations
24 contained in this Act (except those for liquidation of
25 prior contract authorizations) shall not be obligated for con-

1 struction of family quarters for personnel at a cost per family
2 unit in excess of \$14,040 on housing units for generals;
3 \$12,040 on housing units for majors, lieutenant colonels and
4 colonels, or equivalent; \$11,040 on housing units for second
5 lieutenants, lieutenants, captains, and warrant officers, or
6 equivalent; or \$10,040 on housing units for enlisted per-
7 sonnel, except that when such units are constructed outside
8 the continental United States or in Alaska, the average cost
9 per unit of all such units shall not exceed \$25,850 and
10 in no event shall the individual cost exceed \$35,000.
11 The last proviso of section 3 of the Act of June 12, 1948
12 (Public Law 626), and the last proviso in the next to last
13 paragraph of section 3 of the Act of June 16, 1948 (Public
14 Law 653), shall not be applicable to appropriations made
15 herein or heretofore to carry out such Acts, in cases where
16 the Secretary of the Department concerned determines that
17 the erection of prefabricated family quarters will be more
18 advantageous to the United States than multiple type dwell-
19 ings of conventional construction.

20 SEC. 616. Appropriations for the Air Force and
21 the Army for the current fiscal year shall be available for
22 carrying out the purposes of Executive Order 9112 of March
23 26, 1942; for expenses in connection with the administration
24 of occupied areas; for distribution of trophies and devices as
25 authorized by law; for actual and necessary expenses or per

1 diem in lieu thereof authorized by law; and, except as other-
2 wise authorized by the Act of September 30, 1950 (Public
3 Law 874), for primary and secondary schooling for depend-
4 ents of military and civilian personnel of the Department of
5 Defense residing on military installations or stationed in for-
6 eign countries, when the Secretary of the department
7 concerned finds that schools, if any, available in the locality,
8 are unable to provide adequately for the education of such
9 dependents; and appropriations for the Air Force for the
10 current fiscal year shall be available for expenses of tem-
11 porary duty travel of military personnel and for travel ex-
12 penses of civilians (other than on permanent change of
13 station) traveling in connection with the activities of the
14 Air Force.

15 SEC. 617. Appropriations for the Navy for the current
16 fiscal year shall be available for expenses in connec-
17 tion with the transfer to the United States of foreign vessels,
18 including pay, subsistence, transportation, and repatriation
19 of alien crews; expenses including those heretofore incurred
20 incident to the operation by the Navy of private plants taken
21 over at the direction of the President, and the Secretary of
22 the Navy may designate any naval appropriation to be
23 charged with such expenses, proper adjustment to be made
24 on the basis of final costs between applicable appropriations;
25 payment of rewards, as authorized by law, for information

1 leading to the discovery of missing naval property or the
2 recovery thereof, and except as otherwise authorized by the
3 Act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 874), for con-
4 tributions for the support of schools for dependents of military
5 and civilian personnel of the Department of Defense as
6 authorized by section 13 of the Act of August 2, 1946
7 (5 U. S. C. 421d).

8 SEC. 618. No part of any appropriation contained
9 in this Act shall be used directly or indirectly except for
10 temporary employment in case of emergency, for the
11 payment of any civilian for services rendered by him on
12 the Canal Zone while occupying a skilled, technical, clerical,
13 administrative, executive, or supervisory position unless such
14 person is a citizen of the United States of America or of the
15 Republic of Panama: *Provided, however,* (1) That, notwith-
16 standing the provision in the Act approved August 11, 1939
17 (53 Stat. 1409), limiting employment in the above-men-
18 tioned positions to citizens of the United States from and
19 after the date of approval of said Act, citizens of Panama
20 may be employed in such positions; (2) that at no time shall
21 the number of Panamanian citizens employed in the above-
22 mentioned positions exceed the number of citizens of the
23 United States so employed, if United States citizens are avail-
24 able in continental United States or on the Canal Zone; (3)
25 that nothing in this Act shall prohibit the continued em-

1 ployment of any person who shall have rendered fifteen
2 or more years of faithful and honorable service on the Canal
3 Zone; (4) that in the selection of personnel for skilled,
4 technical, administrative, clerical, supervisory, or executive
5 positions, the controlling factors in filling these positions shall
6 be efficiency, experience, training, and education; (5) that
7 all citizens of Panama and the United States rendering skilled,
8 technical, clerical, administrative, executive, or supervisory
9 service on the Canal Zone under the terms of this Act
10 (a) shall normally be employed not more than forty hours
11 per week, (b) may receive as compensation equal rates of
12 pay based upon rates paid for similar employment in con-
13 tinental United States plus 25 per centum; (6) this entire
14 section shall apply only to persons employed in skilled, tech-
15 nical, clerical, administrative, executive, or supervisory posi-
16 tions on the Canal Zone directly or indirectly by any branch
17 of the United States Government or by any corporation or
18 company whose stock is owned wholly or in part by the
19 United States Government: *Provided further*, That the
20 President may suspend from time to time in whole or in part
21 compliance with this section if he should deem such course
22 to be in the public interest.

23 SEC. 619. Insofar as practicable, the Secretary of
24 Defense shall assist American small business to participate
25 equitably in the furnishing of commodities and services

1 financed with funds appropriated under this Act by mak-
2 ing available or causing to be made available to suppliers
3 in the United States, and particularly to small independent
4 enterprises, information, as far in advance as possible, with
5 respect to purchases proposed to be financed with funds
6 appropriated under this Act, and by making available or
7 causing to be made available to purchasing and contracting
8 agencies of the Department of Defense information as to
9 commodities and services produced and furnished by small
10 independent enterprises in the United States, and by other-
11 wise helping to give small business an opportunity to partici-
12 pate in the furnishing of commodities and services financed
13 with funds appropriated by this Act.

14 SEC. 620. During the current fiscal year, commuted ra-
15 tions for enlisted personnel of the uniformed services (as
16 defined in the Career Compensation Act of 1949) on leave,
17 or otherwise authorized to mess separately, shall be equiv-
18 alent to the cost of the ration as determined by the Sec-
19 retary of Defense.

20 SEC. 621. No appropriation contained in this Act shall
21 be available for expenses of operation of messes (other
22 than organized messes which are financed principally
23 from nonappropriated funds) at which meals are sold to
24 officers or civilians except under regulations approved by

1 the Secretary of Defense, which shall (except under un-
2 usual or extraordinary circumstances) establish rates for
3 such meals sufficient to provide reimbursement of operating
4 expenses and food costs to the appropriations concerned:
5 *Provided*, That, for the purposes of this section, payments
6 for meals at the rates established hereunder may be made
7 in cash or by deductions from the pay of civilian employees.

8 SEC. 622. No part of any appropriation contained
9 in this Act shall be available until expended unless ex-
10 pressly so provided elsewhere in this or some other appro-
11 priation Act.

12 SEC. 623. No part of any appropriation contained
13 in this Act shall be available for or on account of
14 the supply or replacement of table linen, dishes, glassware,
15 silver, and kitchen utensils for use in the residences or
16 quarters of officers on shore (other than for field messes,
17 messes temporarily set up on shore for bachelor officers and
18 officers attached to seagoing or district defense vessels, to
19 aviation units based on seagoing vessels, to the fleet air bases,
20 to the submarine bases, or to landing forces and expeditions),
21 except in accordance with regulations approved by the Sec-
22 retary of Defense, which shall provide for uniform practices
23 among all of the services.

24 SEC. 624. The provisions of the Act of February 9,
25 1946 (60 Stat. 3), shall be applicable to the appropriations

1 of the Army and Air Force for military pay for the current
2 fiscal year, upon certification by the appropriate agency
3 of the department concerned.

4 SEC. 625. Not more than \$10,000,000 of the amounts
5 received during the current fiscal year by each of the De-
6 partments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force as proceeds
7 from the sale of scrap or salvage materials, shall be available
8 during the current fiscal year for expenses of transportation,
9 demilitarization, and other preparation for sale or salvage
10 of military supplies, equipment, and matériel: *Provided*,
11 That a report of receipts and disbursements under this limita-
12 tion shall be made quarterly to the Committees on Appro-
13 priations of the Congress.

14 SEC. 626. During the current fiscal year, the President
15 may exempt appropriations, funds, and contract author-
16 izations, available for military functions under the Depart-
17 ment of Defense, from the provisions of subsection (c) of
18 section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, whenever
19 he deems such action to be necessary in the interest of
20 national defense.

21 SEC. 627. Appropriations available during the current
22 fiscal year for the pay and allowances of midshipmen ap-
23 pointed under paragraph (b) of section 3 of the Act of
24 August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1058), as amended (34 U. S. C.
25 1020b), shall be available for a 50 per centum increase of

1 the pay of such midshipmen while in flight training or on
2 other flight duty.

3 SEC. 628. No appropriation contained in this Act shall
4 be available for any direct expense ~~(including commercial~~
5 ~~transportation in the United States to the place of sale but~~
6 ~~excluding all transportation outside the United States)~~ in
7 connection with the maintenance, conduct, operation, or
8 management of sales commissaries, or commissary stores, of
9 agencies of the Department of Defense, except where reim-
10 bursement for such expenses is to be made to the appro-
11 priations concerned from the proceeds of sales therein.

12 *SEC. 628. No appropriation contained in this Act shall*
13 *be available on and after January 1, 1952, in connection*
14 *with the operation of commissary stores of the agencies of the*
15 *Department of Defense for the cost of purchase and main-*
16 *tenance of operating equipment and supplies and for the*
17 *actual or estimated cost of utilities as may be furnished by the*
18 *Government and of shrinkage, spoilage, and pilferage of*
19 *merchandise under the control of such commissary stores,*
20 *except as authorized under regulations promulgated by the*
21 *Secretaries of the military departments concerned, with the*
22 *approval of the Secretary of Defense, which regulations shall*
23 *provide for reimbursement therefor to the appropriations*
24 *concerned and, notwithstanding any other provision of law,*
25 *shall provide for the adjustment of the sales prices in such*

1 commissary stores to the extent necessary to furnish sufficient
2 gross revenue from sales of commissary stores to make such
3 reimbursement: *Provided, however, That under such regu-*
4 *lations as may be issued pursuant to this section all utilities*
5 *may be furnished without cost to the commissary stores outside*
6 *the continental United States and in Alaska.*

7 SEC. 629. No part of any appropriation contained in
8 this Act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any
9 person who engages in a strike against the Government of
10 the United States or who is a member of an organization
11 of Government employees that asserts the right to strike
12 against the Government of the United States, or who ad-
13 vocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates,
14 the overthrow of the Government of the United States by
15 force or violence: *Provided, That for the purposes hereof an*
16 *affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the*
17 *person making the affidavit has not contrary to the provisions*
18 *of this section engaged in a strike against the Government of*
19 *the United States, is not a member of an organization of*
20 *Government employees that asserts the right to strike against*
21 *the Government of the United States, or that such person*
22 *does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization*
23 *that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the*
24 *United States by force or violence: Provided further, That*

1 any person who engages in a strike against the Government
2 of the United States or who is a member of an organization
3 of Government employees that asserts the right to strike
4 against the Government of the United States, or who advo-
5 cates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates,
6 the overthrow of the Government of the United States by
7 force or violence and accepts employment the salary or
8 wages for which are paid from any appropriation contained
9 in this Act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction,
10 shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned for not
11 more than one year, or both: *Provided further*, That the
12 above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in
13 substitution for, any other provisions of existing law.

14 *SEC. 630. In order more effectively to administer the*
15 *programs and functions of the Department of Defense, the*
16 *President, to the extent he deems it necessary and appropriate*
17 *in the interest of national defense, may authorize within the*
18 *Office of the Secretary of Defense fifteen temporary positions*
19 *to be placed in grades GS-17 and GS-18 of the general sched-*
20 *ule of the Classification Act of 1949 in accordance with the*
21 *procedures and standards of that Act. Not more than eight*
22 *of these positions shall be in grade GS-18. Such positions*
23 *shall be additional to the number authorized by section 505*
24 *of that Act.*

1 *SEC. 631. No part of any money appropriated in titles*
2 *II, III, IV, or V of this Act shall be expended under any*
3 *contract (other than a contract for personal services) entered*
4 *into after the enactment of this Act unless such contract*
5 *provides—*

6 *(1) that the Government may, by written notice to*
7 *the contractor, terminate the right of such contractor*
8 *to proceed under such contract if it is found, after notice*
9 *and hearing, by the Secretary of the military depart-*
10 *ment with which the contract is made, or his designee, that*
11 *gratuities (in the form of entertainment, gifts, or other-*
12 *wise) were offered by such contractor, or any agent or*
13 *representative of such contractor, to any officer or em-*
14 *ployee of the Government with a view toward securing a*
15 *contract or securing favorable treatment with respect to*
16 *the awarding or amending, or the making of any de-*
17 *terminations with respect to the performing, of such con-*
18 *tract: Provided, That the existence of the facts upon*
19 *which such Secretary makes such findings shall be in*
20 *issue and may be reviewed in any competent court,*

21 *(2) that in the event any such contract is so termi-*
22 *nated the Government shall be entitled, (A) to pursue*
23 *the same remedies against the contractor as it could*
24 *pursue in the event of a breach of the contract by the*
25 *contractor, and (B) as a penalty in addition to any*

1 *other damages to which it may be entitled by law, to*
2 *exemplary damages in an amount not less than three nor*
3 *more than ten times (as determined by the Secretary or*
4 *his designee) the costs incurred by any such contractor*
5 *in providing any such gratuities to any such officer or*
6 *employee.*

7 *SEC. 632. No funds appropriated in titles II, III, IV,*
8 *and V of this Act shall be used for the payment in excess*
9 *of 530,000 full-time graded civilian employees at any one*
10 *time during the current fiscal year.*

11 SEC. ~~630~~ 633. This Act may be cited as the "Depart-
12 ment of Defense Appropriation Act, 1952".

Passed the House of Representatives August 9, 1951.

Attest:

RALPH R. ROBERTS,

Clerk.

AN ACT

Making appropriations for the National Security Council, the National Security Resources Board, and for military functions administered by the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

AUGUST 10 (legislative day, AUGUST 1), 1951

Read twice and referred to the Committee on
Appropriations

SEPTEMBER 7 (legislative day, SEPTEMBER 4), 1951

Reported with amendments

ber 15. The amendment was placed on a House bill which passed the Senate last year but did not become a law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia has asked unanimous consent that the pending business be laid aside temporarily, and that House bill 4014 may be immediately considered. Is there objection?

Mr. LANGER. Reserving the right to object, what would the bill cost, if anything?

Mr. BYRD. It would cost nothing. It would simply extend the time of filing returns from September 15 to November 15.

Mr. LANGER. I have no objection.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator agree to withdraw his request if there is any debate in connection with the bill?

Mr. BYRD. I do not think there will be any debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4014) to amend section 3121 of the Internal Revenue Code, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with an amendment, on page 2, after line 2, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding the 6-month limitation contained in section 53 (a) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code, extensions of time may be granted under such section, but not beyond November 15, 1951, for the filing by any corporation subject to the excess-profits tax imposed by chapter 1 of such code of the return of the taxes imposed by such chapter for any taxable year ending after June 30, 1950, and before February 1, 1951.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 5054) making appropriations for the National Security Council, the National Security Resources Board, and for military functions administered by the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report (No. 730) thereon.

READJUSTMENT OF POSTAL RATES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1046) to readjust postal rates.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I should like to read and then send to the desk.

On page 14, line 9, after the words "2 cents", I move to insert the following:

Provided, That there shall be no increase in the present postage rates on such postals and post cards as are handwritten and used for correspondence by any individual and not for advertising purposes or purposes of commercial or political solicitation or for purposes of notice of commercial

indebtedness: *And, provided further*, That the Postmaster General is authorized to prescribe the form of card which may be employed at the respective rates provided by this subsection and to promulgate such regulations as may be necessary to their use.

Mr. President, this amendment would simply provide that a post card written by hand by a private individual would not be subject to the 2-cent rate, and its administration should be very simple. It provides that a handwritten post card, not used for personal advertising, going through the mail, would not take the 2-cent rate. It would be a different type of card from other cards. It would amount to no more than approximately 5 percent of the post cards going through the mail. It would be very simple to administer, far more simple than would the original amendment. Therefore I do not see why there should be any objection to it from an administrative standpoint.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG].

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana. I think it is well known in the committee that I sponsored, with some modifications, the particular amendment he offered previously. I was very much in favor of a change in the proposed legislation which would permit charitable organizations to use the postal card at the reduced rate. But rather than to make exemptions, I think it is best we follow through and legislate as the committee approved the measure.

The distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] who took the opposite view, convinced me that he was right, and I voted with him this afternoon.

I trust the Senate will reject the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana, because it confuses the issue, and would not help many people. If, as a result of its study, the committee which will be created under the terms of the bill should find that a different action should be taken, we will come back and recommend it to the full committee.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I have just learned from the distinguished chairman of the committee that the adoption of this amendment would cost the taxpayers \$2,000,000 a year. It is my sincere hope that the Senate will, by defeating the amendment, protect the taxpayers against this heavy loss.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I should like to point out that the Senate has already voted to knock \$17,000,000 worth of postal increases out of the bill, so how would it help much if my amendment were defeated? Commercial advertisers used third-class mail in advertising their goods, and they use it at a loss to the taxpayers. In other words, if I am in the advertising business, all I have to do is to buy stamps costing 1½ cents each, as many as I want to buy, and send out as much mail as I choose, advertising shirts, shoes, or whatever I may be advertising for sale by mail order. Such mail can be sent by the thousands at a

cost to the taxpayers of 50 percent of the expense of delivering it.

Mr. President, the Senate has already knocked \$17,000,000 from the bill. I have offered an amendment which would save, first, for an ordinary user of a handwritten postal card, about \$2,500,000 and result in that much saving for the ordinary persons. There are still some poor people in the United States who would like to use a penny postal card. It would reduce the increase in rates by about \$2,500,000, but would leave the increase of about \$42,000,000 resulting from the increased rate on ordinary postal cards.

Mr. President, I should be glad to support a motion to return the \$17,000,000 which was cut from the bill by involving advertisers using third-class mail. I would be glad to support any amendment offered to get more money from second-class mail which is used by private individuals to make a profit out of all the taxpayers. I believe that my proposal for a penny postal card, not used for commercial purposes, should be adopted.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. As I understand, the Senator's amendment applies only to hand-written postal cards, not to printed postal cards, not to postal cards used for the purpose of advertising an article, or anything of that sort.

Mr. LONG. If a card is printed or typed it would not be covered by my amendment. Therefore, it would still be subject to the 2-cent rate.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LONG. Yes.

Mr. LEHMAN. I wish to say to the Senator from Louisiana that I voted against the previous amendment, which I thought was not justified. But I intend to vote for the pending amendment, because I have received many hundreds, if not thousands, of postal cards, as other Senators have. Probably I have received more such cards than other Senators receive, because of the great number of people who live in the State I have the honor in part to represent. My experience is that when a man or a woman takes the trouble to write a card in his or her own hand, the card really contains something worthy of consideration, and, in my opinion, the writing of such cards should be encouraged rather than discouraged. Therefore, I shall vote for the amendment.

Mr. LONG. I thank the Senator from New York.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG. I will yield in a moment.

Mr. President, those who want to make a record for economy can make a motion, in fact, if no other Member of the Senate does, I shall later move to reconsider the vote whereby we took off the second and third increases on third-class mail. It is on that class of mail that the Government should get some more revenue. Senators can decide how they want to vote on that point. It would seem to me inconsistent to vote, first, to require less money from those who are making money at the expense of the

Government, whereby we would save \$17,000,000 to the taxpayers, and, second, with respect to something which will be of benefit to the average citizen of the country, vote to save \$2,500,000 at the expense of the ordinary citizen who is also a taxpayer. It seems inconsistent that we should permit advertisers through the mails to benefit, and not do something to benefit the ordinary individual.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. In other words, the Senator's amendment would aid the blind, the orphans, the cripples, and such organizations as really are interested in charity, who make appeals by postal cards written by hand.

Mr. LONG. Yes.

Mr. President, the amendment is of personal interest to the Senator from Louisiana. I served on the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and offered the amendment 2 years ago. When I ran for office someone attempted to misconstrue my position, and I was asked: "Is it true, RUSSELL, that you are trying to take away our penny postal cards?" I had to explain that I was not trying to take away the penny postal cards from the average person, but that I felt that an advertiser who was using a postal card for commercial advertising could well afford to pay 2 cents. I believe it will be found that a great many Americans would still like to have the benefit of the penny postal card, because it costs so little. I think it is a good idea to retain the penny postal card if the communication on it is written by hand.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. For the purpose of keeping the record straight, I wish to say that my friend from Louisiana alluded a moment ago to a modification of the third-class rate. I suppose he is referring to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico which struck out the proviso on page 14 of the bill yesterday.

Mr. LONG. I was not on the floor at the time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Is that the one the Senator referred to?

Mr. LONG. I understand that such an amendment would knock off about \$17,000,000 of the increase in postal rates.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I simply wanted to get the record straight by saying that that portion of the amendment would not become effective for at least 1 year, so it did not involve any actual revenue, because in the interim period the investigating committee set up under the provisions of Senate bill 1046 will be apt to come in with a report and indicate what the situation is, and then Congress will be free, of course, to fix the rate at 1½ cents or even more.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, for the past 4 years we have been trying to secure an increase in postal rates, particularly the third-class rate. The Senator's proposal would postpone the day

when we would secure such an increase.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. Would not adoption of the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana require either that the postmaster or someone in the post office read almost every penny postal card that went through the post office?

Mr. LONG. It would require a person in the post office to take a look at it, and if he noticed that the card was not handwritten, but was of the 1-cent form, of course, he would reject the card, that is, he would either not send it on or would return it. The same thing is true with regard to all third-class mail. If such mail matter is sealed, it does not go through the mail. It is necessary for those who handle letters to notice whether third-class letters have been sealed, and if they are sealed, they require 3 cents mail, but if not sealed, 1½ cents.

Mr. SMATHERS. How much more money would it cost the taxpayers to hire extra men to read every penny postal card to see whether, for example, in the second paragraph there was not some advertising?

Mr. LONG. The few not written by hand, but containing commercial advertisements which might pass possibly through the post office, to the loss of the Post Office Department, would be so infinitesimal in number as hardly to be worth bothering about.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. HUNT. I should like to state a practical situation to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, and to get his comments. It is a generally accepted method of campaigning to address a penny postal card, and then by some very wonderful reproductions, through photographic processes, thousands of other copies of the same postal card appear to be simply handwritten postal cards. What would be the effect of the Senator's amendment on that type of card?

Mr. LONG. The answer is very simple. It is true that a postal card might be multigraphed in such a manner that it would almost look as though it were written by hand, and it would take a trained eye to detect it. But the Senator well knows that even when that process is used, it is necessary to address the postal card. It would be expensive for a person to sit down and address each card by hand. It would be an impossibility for a person to cut an addressograph plate which would look as though it were handwritten. It might be that a person would go to an enormous expense to try to cheat the Post Office. If someone should invent a technical and complicated machine for such a purpose, I believe that by the time such a machine was developed we could find a way to prevent the abuse.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. HUNT. It would not be in any sense of the word an attempt to deceive

the postal officials. However, it is a good method of political campaigning. In States such as mine, where the population is not so large as that in the Senator's State, some of us sit up late at night personally addressing postal cards.

Mr. LONG. What the Senator says has much merit. I myself have used that method, although I have not attempted to deceive anyone on the question of whether or not a penny postal card was personally written by hand.

I should like to point out that the reason why it would not be easy to evade the law is that when postal cards are sent in large quantities they must be dropped in the mail as bulk mail. If a person wanted to beat the Government out of 1 cent, in connection with a postal card, he would have great difficulty in dropping a different card in each post office. When a great number of cards are mailed, the post-office employee who examines the bulk mailing can tell at once what the card is being used for. If a person is using a postal card which requires 2 cents postage, instead of 1 cent, a quick examination of the card will reveal whether or not it is being improperly used.

Mr. HUNT. It is not in any sense of the word an attempt to deceive postal officials. It is in every sense of the word an attempt to get a personal message directly to the voter. With all due deference to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, I believe we are running into an administrative feature which is going to be very difficult to handle.

Mr. LONG. The amendment provides that such a postal card may not be used for political purposes. It seems to me that it would be very difficult for a person attempting to campaign in such a manner—to make political solicitations, to use the words of the amendment—if he wanted to solicit votes on a large scale, to find a machine which would make all the cards look as though they were handwritten, and then drop them into individual post offices, so as to make it difficult for the Post Office Department to detect. It would be very much simpler to pay 2 cents for the card.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. It would be very simple for the Postmaster to require a card of a certain color.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I merely wish to point out the issue, so that there can be no misapprehension about it.

The first amendment offered by my friend from Louisiana was to make an exception in the case of postal cards used by philanthropic, temperance, and religious organizations, as well as cards used for personal correspondence. In his second amendment the exception applies only to cards used for personal correspondence, as I understand, and the remainder of the original amendment is stricken out.

The revenue involved is not the important consideration at all. First of all, we would place upon the Post Office Department the duty of performing a new administrative function in deter-

amend, when a cloture petition is presented, two-thirds of the Senators present and voting shall be required to constitute a sufficient majority.

The Senate will remember the resolution to amend the cloture rule offered several years ago by the two Senators I have mentioned, and that it was debated, at a time when it seemed that all negotiations had broken down, and that we would go back to the old rule, under which it had been impossible, during all the previous years, to have cloture applied on a motion to proceed to the consideration of a measure. Finally an amendment to the rule was adopted requiring a constitutional two-thirds majority for the adoption of a motion to proceed to consideration. I am satisfied that a step in the right direction was taken when that amendment to the rule was adopted.

At that time I said, as I have said since then on many occasions, that I have some rather strong feelings in regard to what should be the constitutional majority which should decide the question of the adoption of a motion to consider and that I have always been in favor of having for that purpose a rule calling for two-thirds of the Senators present and voting.

The ranking majority member of the Committee on Rules and Administration has set for hearings the resolutions which have been submitted by many other Members of the Senate relative to a change in the rule, some proposals calling for a constitutional majority constituting 49 of the Members, and others calling for only a plain majority of the members present and voting.

Once again I should like very much to get before that committee and before the Senate the resolution which the cosponsor of the resolution, the Senator from Arizona, and myself submitted to the Senate, and which I felt should be adopted by the Senate as the rule to be written into the rule book on the question of the adoption of a cloture petition on a motion to consider.

After the committee hears the witnesses in regard to the various resolutions, I hope the committee will report a resolution to carry out at least a change providing for having two-thirds of the Members of the Senate present and voting suffice to adopt a cloture petition which has been filed in connection with a motion to consider any piece of proposed legislation.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, does the Senator from Nebraska have time in which to yield to me?

Mr. WHERRY. I am not sure; but if I have not, I shall ask for further time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The present proceedings are by means of a unanimous-consent arrangement.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 3 minutes additional.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Nebraska is recognized for 3 minutes additional.

Mr. WHERRY. Now I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I wish to commend the distinguished minority leader for the action he is taking in connection with this matter.

As he will recall, and as will also be recalled by many other Senators, I was among those who opposed the so-called Wherry resolution which, as I remember, was adopted in 1949. I opposed it because I thought it never could work successfully and did not solve our problem.

I am very glad to see the Senator from Nebraska take the action he has taken today. It is a definite step in the right direction.

I happen to be among those who are sponsoring an amendment to the rules which would accomplish by means of a constitutional majority of 49 Senators the purpose the Senator has in mind. I think such an arrangement would be more effective and more desirable.

However, above all things, it seems to me to be high time that the Senate of the United States reaches a condition whereby it can control its activities. The lack of any requirement of germaneness or time limitation in connection with our proceedings, as a consequence of which any Senator may speak at any time for as long as he wishes, provided he can get the floor, is not conducive to the kind of action which a legislative body, particularly one of the dignity and responsibility of the Senate of the United States, should provide for, either at this or any other time.

So I am always glad to see efforts made to bring about such changes in the rules as I have indicated.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I commend the Senator from Nebraska for his resolution.

As one who submitted a resolution to the same effect in the Seventy-eighth, the Seventy-ninth, and the Eightieth Congresses, I hope further step may be taken in accordance with the provisions of the Senator's resolution.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I desire to thank both Senators who have addressed the Senate in regard to the resolution.

I wish to say that when the Wherry cloture rule was submitted, it was done in a spirit of compromise. In adopting it I think we did go a long way toward accomplishing what I believe the Senate will finally accomplish. I was on record then, and have been on record since then, and am on record today, as being ready and willing at any time to have the Senate consider a resolution providing for the adoption by the vote of two-thirds of the Senators present and voting of a cloture petition on a motion to consider. I think that would be fair. Of course there are other Senators who wish to go beyond that. However, I think such an arrangement would provide for a good, fair determination; and if we had such a rule, I believe it would put an end to a great deal of the difficulty we have experienced in times past.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes, if I have any time remaining. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have an additional 2 minutes, in order to permit the Senator from Nevada to question me.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I wonder whether the distinguished junior Senator from Nebraska anticipates that there would not be a full attendance of Senators for the remainder of the first session of the Eighty-first Congress.

Mr. WHERRY. I am not determining that. I appreciate very much the suggestion.

Mr. President, now that additional time has been granted, I believe I should point out once again to the Members of the Senate that the so-called Wherry cloture rule did not in any way amend the procedure by which we amend our rules. So if this proposal is to be adopted or if any other amendment is to be made to the rules, there must be a determined will on the part of the Senate to break a filibuster, if there is to be any change in the rule in regard to cloture petitions.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further to me?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MALONE. Does the distinguished junior Senator from Nebraska anticipate that it will be impossible to bring Senators to the floor for anything so important? In other words, the proposal now made must be on the assumption that it would be impossible to obtain a full attendance of Members on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. No; I would guarantee to the distinguished Senator that if this matter ever comes from the Rules Committee and is reported to the Senate, the Senator will not have to worry about having Senators present on the floor. Certainly they will be here, believe me.

Mr. MALONE. Then what is the purpose of the proposed rule, if we think we can always have Senators here when we really need them?

Mr. WHERRY. The purpose is, instead of requiring a constitutional two-thirds majority, or 64 Senators, in order to make a determination in regard to whether a cloture petition should be adopted in connection with a motion to consider, is to enable two-thirds of the Senators present and voting to determine the question. It is my judgment that in connection with the vital questions which have been raised here in connection with many issues, there would be no trouble in getting Senators in attendance. That question really is not involved in this matter.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; if I have time in which to do so.

Mr. MALONE. Then the Senator from Nebraska must assume that Senators will be so busy elsewhere that the Senate could proceed with, let us say, six or eight Senators who might happen to be present, who then could invoke cloture.

Mr. WHERRY. No, Mr. President; I disagree with my good friend, the Senator from Nevada. Usually I am in complete agreement with him; but, with respect to his last observation, I am satisfied that if the rule I am suggesting should be reported by the Committee on Rules and Administration and should come before the Senate, there would be the best attendance of Senators that there has been in many years on the floor, to discuss the rule. If the proposed new rule is adopted, I believe it will be a fair one, because I am inclined to believe that a rule permitting cloture to be invoked by means of the favorable votes of two-thirds of the Members present and voting will provide the proper balance needed in connection with the consideration of a motion to invoke cloture in connection with any legislative proposal which it is desired to bring before the Senate for consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Nebraska has again expired.

If there are no further routine matters, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5054) making appropriations for the National Security Council, the National Security Resources Board, and for military functions administered by the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	McKellar
Benton	Hendrickson	McMahon
Bricker	Hennings	Millikin
Butler, Md.	Hickenlooper	Monroney
Butler, Nebr.	Hill	Moody
Byrd	Hoey	Morse
Cain	Holland	Murray
Capehart	Humphrey	Neely
Carlson	Hunt	Nixon
Case	Ives	O'Connor
Clements	Jenner	O'Mahoney
Connally	Johnson, Colo.	Pastore
Cordon	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Dirksen	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Douglas	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Duff	Kem	Schoeppel
Dworshak	Kerr	Smathers
Eastland	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Ecton	Knowland	Smith, N. C.
Ellender	Langer	Stennis
Ferguson	Long	Taft
Flanders	Malone	Underwood
Frear	Martin	Watkins
Fulbright	Maybank	Wherry
George	McClellan	Williams
Gillelte	McFarland	Young

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], and the Senator from

Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business in connection with their attendance at the conference for the signing of the Japanese Peace Treaty at San Francisco, Calif.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senators from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY and Mr. McCARTHY] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of illness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLEMENTS in the chair). A quorum is present.

The Senator from Wyoming is recognized.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the bill before the Senate today is the Defense Department appropriation bill, carrying funds for the Army, the Navy, and the United States Air Force. It is a very substantial bill in terms of dollars, and I felt that it would be desirable for Members of the Senate to have a brief explanation of some of the reasons why the expenditures are so great, and I think the country is entitled to have that information.

In the first place, I want the Senate to know, that the consideration of this measure began in the House of Representatives on May 7 and terminated there on July 18. For 11 weeks, if I calculate correctly, the House Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Armed Services studied in detail every item in the bill. They went over with a fine-tooth comb the budget estimates which were submitted, and subjected the witnesses who came from the Department of Defense to the closest possible questioning in developing what the appropriations ought to be.

After this process had been in progress for a month, it became clear to me, as chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Armed Services, that if we on this side waited until after the House had gone through the bill item by item, it would take weeks after the House had acted before we would be able to compile our record. So I called the subcommittee to begin its hearings on the Senate side on June 7. Those hearings did not terminate until August 28. The House passed the bill on August 9, and now on September 10 the bill is before the Senate for its consideration.

Marked up by the subcommittee, supervised again and marked up again by the full committee, the Senate has here the recommendation of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate for the enactment of this measure. I do not know whether in my experience any bill has ever received closer scrutiny and at-

tention by the members of the Appropriations Committees of both Houses, that this bill has received.

Here on the desk I have the record of the Senate hearings. The volume contains 1,910 pages. Much testimony which was gathered has been omitted from publication for reasons of national security. This was as thorough a study as I have ever seen of any appropriation bill throughout my service in the Senate. It was believed desirable, however, Mr. President, by the subcommittee and by the full committee that we should make clear to the country that not all of the \$61,000,000,000-plus contained in this measure could possibly be expended during the fiscal year 1952. The reason is that we are living in a scientific age which requires time for the production of defense weapons, many of which are as expensive to build, and sometimes far more expensive to build, than a great skyscraper in a large metropolitan city, or than a great engineering work upon the rivers or in the harbors of the United States. We must get the notion out of our heads that by the appropriation of a large sum in dollars we are waving a magic wand that will bring into existence immediately the commodities, the great instruments which we are authorizing to be constructed for the national defense.

I had hoped to have here today to exhibit to the Members of the Senate the new radar instrument which is being built for the latest strategic plane which is being constructed for the United States Air Force, and side by side with it a Norden bombsight which was used during World War II. Unfortunately I did not call for them in time. These two exhibits are at Wright Field, and I could not have them here, but I can describe them to the Members of the Senate.

We all remember what a great achievement it was believed to be when during World War II the Norden bombsight was invented and brought into production. The Norden bombsight was so secret that the pilots on the bombers which carried it were under instruction that, if they were shot down, to destroy the bombsight before the plane landed, if it were at all possible to do so. The first order of priority, if a bomber was shot down, was for the crew to destroy the bombsight so that it would not fall into the hands of the enemy.

These bombsights, costing \$8,000 per unit, were used in the B-17 bombers, which cost about \$417,000 per unit. The new modern plane flies so high and so fast that the Norden bombsight is now utterly useless for such flights. It is absolutely impossible now to obtain visual sighting of bombing targets. The new modern bombsight is a radar instrument. It does not cost \$8,000, nor \$16,000, nor \$32,000, nor \$64,000, nor even \$128,000. These new radar bombsights cost \$250,000 each.

Mr. STENNIS. For each bomber?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. For each bomber. The new plane flies two and one-half times as high and at least two and one-half times as fast as the old bomber. And the end is not yet.

Mr. President, we can talk about the development of these new instruments

of warfare, and the great cost which accompanies them, but I want to lay emphasis upon the time factor because of the effect the time factor has upon the actual expenditures. It takes 7 months from the date of purchase of the materials for a uniform, to turn them into the uniform. That, of course, is all well within a fiscal year. But it takes from 12 to 14 to 17 to 24 months to build some of the new weapons and the new airplanes. It takes 36 months to build an aircraft carrier, from the day the contract is let until the vessel is delivered.

Of course the goods must be delivered before the payment is made, and months elapse between the date of the contract and the delivery of the commodity. In order, however, that we may have continuous production, in order that the contractor may know when the contract is signed that he will get his money and that the materials can be ordered and all the expenses undertaken which are necessary to build these great new instruments, it is necessary to appropriate the cash.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I know the Senator has given great thought and study and much consideration to this over-all subject. I was interested in what the Senator had to say about the lag in time before the finished article comes off the production line. No doubt the great bulk of these expenditures is going into the development of aircraft and all the incidentals thereto. What I am wondering about is this: Will production be drawn out over such a length of time, and the commitments in dollars and cents so made, that we will find ourselves with a vast, moving, changing, scientific picture in the aircraft industry with probably an oversupply of obsolete aircraft? I wonder if the Senator at sometime in his discussion will be able, without divulging information we should not have, to touch upon that point.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am very glad to answer the question now. It was a question which suggested itself to many members of the committee. We checked up on it. The plan of this budget has been designed to produce first of all the type of weapon which is desired. That was a matter of decision. I said "to produce." I meant rather, to decide upon the type of military equipment which the best judgment of the military forces concluded was a desirable instrument. Then it was decided that attention should be given to the preparation of the production lines so that when the time came and an emergency was upon us, we would be in the position to use such production lines by overtime and all that sort of thing, to produce the weapons. But it is the policy to avoid producing all these weapons now and storing up large inventories of weapons which might be outmoded because of the rapid development of scientific and technological progress. The purpose is to obtain instruments and machines which

can be modified as scientific developments show that they ought to be modified.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator will recall that the committee was shown some charts which were very explanatory of just what the Senator from Kansas was asking the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee? Having in mind the fact that some of the planes would become obsolete, they built their full production up to a certain point, and then, as the new planes began to come in, it was their hope that the production of the new planes would be built up and the production of the old type planes would be very much sloughed off. I thought the charts were very helpful in understanding that specific problem. Does the Senator agree?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator's memory is very good. I compliment him upon it. If he will turn to page 1266 of the RECORD he will find that the Senator from Massachusetts asked practically the same question which has just been asked by the Senator from Kansas. I read:

Senator SALTONSTALL. Now, I may ask you a slightly different question. You built up all this Air Force. Have you given sufficient consideration to the maintenance of it on account of obsolescence and repairs, and so on, but particularly obsolescence. There was a great deal of opinion a few years ago with regard to obsolescence between the Navy and Air Force. If we get up into a 150-wing Air Force, have you given any idea as to the cost of obsolescence each year? It will run into the billions of dollars.

Under Secretary McCone, of the Air Force, responded as follows:

Mr. McCONE. That is correct. It will run into the billions of dollars. Experience has proven that we must declare our fighter planes obsolete in about 3 years and our bombers in 6 to 7 years and our transports in 7 to 8 years. That factor of obsolescence together with the attrition from losses, that is, the peacetime attrition, are worked into the table of replacements. It creates a very substantial bill each year. The support of an air force is an expensive thing.

The charts to which the Senator refers indicated the desire to get the production lines in being, so that the production could be stepped up if the need should arise. In the meantime a smaller number of planes or guns or other weapons would be ordered. I will say to the Senator from Kansas that in my opinion this question has been pretty well covered in this budget. It calls to mind the plan which is being used. It was described by General Lawton, of the Signal Corps. I wish that every Member of the Senate could have heard the testimony of General Lawton. He has the rare faculty of being able to draw a word picture of the things which he is describing. He was speaking of a particular instrument, a new scientific device which has never been manufactured heretofore. It was developed by the Research and Development Division of the Army. Such work is highly necessary for the perfection of electronic devices for use in modern warfare. Such devices are

used, of course, both on the ground and in the air.

In connection with industrial mobilization, the plan is to give a test order to a manufacturer to develop a certain type of electronic device which is deemed to be necessary. Then, having trained the personnel of the factory, its formen and its mechanics, on a small order, the Army knows that if an emergency should come and a large number of such instruments should become necessary, it would be much easier to get quick production. In the meantime a small amount is received.

I have been emphasizing the fact that it takes time to build these instruments.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? Does the Senator wish to answer interrogations now as to the amounts, or would he rather wait until later?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me make this preliminary statement, and then I shall be glad to answer questions.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask a few questions.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall be very happy to answer the questions of the Senator.

Because of the great lead time in the manufacture of the new, modern, highly scientific and fantastic instruments by which man now conquers the atmosphere itself, it is necessary to appropriate the cash, so that the contractors will know that they can be sure of getting their money. Some years ago Congress had fallen into the habit, in connection with other bills, of providing cash and contract authority. When contract authority was given in the bill it was a declaration by Congress that the particular department for which the appropriation was made would have the authority to make a contract for X dollars, which would be paid for at some future time. Therefore it did not appear in the sum total of cash appropriated, and for that reason Congress came to the conclusion that contract authority should not be included in appropriation bills, so that the country and the Congress would know, when an appropriation bill was passed, precisely how much cash was available.

However, because of the long lead time under the system of appropriating cash, and because of delay in deliveries, the department necessarily has unexpended funds at the end of the year. So it was the determination of the committee that it would endeavor to show to the Congress how much of the appropriation for procurement could be expended in 1952, and how much could not possibly be expended in 1953, thus making it clear that while this is a \$61,000,000,000 appropriation bill, it does not turn \$61,000,000,000 into the stream of national purchasing power during the fiscal year 1952, and therefore does not have the inflationary effect which might be expected to follow from an appropriation of \$61,000,000,000.

In order to make it clear that there was a carry-over from the previous year, I asked the Department to give us the exact figures of the carry-over. First, let me say that in the sessions of the

Joint Economic Committee we went into this same question, and a table was prepared to show the carry-over and the annual expenditure year by year, for the Department of Defense and for the Government as a whole.

The table will be found at page 1482 of the hearings. For example, the carry-over from 1951, brought forward from prior years into 1951, was \$9,400,000,000 according to the estimate when the table was prepared, and the authority granted in 1951 amounted to \$47,600,000,000. Therefore, the Defense Department had a total of \$57,000,000,000 available for expenditure. The actual budget expenditures during fiscal 1951 amounted to only \$19,200,000,000, leaving a carry-over of \$37,800,000,000 for the next year.

Apparently that estimate was a little bit too high, according to the figures which I obtained yesterday. The Defense Department reported to me yesterday that the carry-over into fiscal 1952 is \$36,004,000,000. Therefore, if we add that carry-over to the appropriation of \$61,000,000,000, which is contained in the pending bill, we have a figure of approximately \$97,000,000,000-plus, which will be available for expenditure. The best estimate we have had, unless there is a speed-up, is that the expenditure during fiscal 1952 will scarcely be more than the estimate of \$40,000,000,000, which was made when the report was prepared. I should say that probably it will be more than that.

From the report which is before the Senate, it will be found that the pending bill provides \$37,955,235,030 for expenditure in fiscal 1952 and \$23,148,621,000 for expenditure in fiscal 1953, making a total of \$61,103,856,030.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator from Wyoming for the explanation. There are one or two questions I should like to propound to him. At the top of page 2, in the second paragraph, the report discloses: "Funds to be expended in fiscal year 1952 and thereafter, \$37,955,235,030." That is the part of the 1952 military defense bill which we are considering now—the total being \$61,103,856,030—which it is anticipated will be expended during fiscal year 1952. Is that correct?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct. The Senator will observe that we say "and thereafter." It may be that some of it will be carried over.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand that, but I believe the fact should be made clear that even that amount of money may not be the full amount that would be expended in 1952.

I should like to ask one further question of the distinguished Senator from Wyoming. Taking the figure \$37,955,235,030, which is the part which it anticipated will be expended out of the 1952 appropriations—the balance being \$23,148,621,000, which is to be carried over into fiscal year 1953 and thereafter—to that figure of \$37,955,235,030 is to be added the carry-over or that part of the carry-over which may also be expended in 1952. Is that correct?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. They have that money; yes, indeed. That money is available.

Mr. WHERRY. What is the total sum? According to the report it is \$44,278,000,000.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. An error was made in that figure. General Moore, of the Department of Defense, from whom I had obtained the information when we wrote the report on Friday night, called me on Saturday to state that in his haste to get us the figures he had duplicated an amount, and that the actual figure is \$36,004,000,000, and that the difference is to be found in the first line of the appropriations for the Army, which, instead of \$21,546,000,000, should read \$13,272,000,000.

Mr. WHERRY. May I ask whether it is contemplated that the \$36,004,000,000 will be expended in 1952?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator from Nebraska will look at page 1482 of the hearings he will see that the budget expenditures lag behind the total funds available, and that under the program which was developed by the Department of Defense, expenditures in 1952, including carryover funds and new obligational authority, would amount to \$40,000,000,000—although I believe it would be more than that, because we are speeding up the program—\$55,500,000,000 in 1953, and then downward to \$50,000,000,000 in 1954, \$40,000,000,000 in 1955, and \$35,000,000,000 in 1956.

That may be only a pious hope, but the theory upon which we are operating is that we are carrying on a preventive campaign against war. We are engaged in a battle for the minds of the people of the world, and it is our purpose to make clear to everyone in the world that the United States wants peace, not war, but that we will be ready for war if war comes. I believe that thought was never better expressed by anyone than it was by the late Admiral Sherman, when he testified before the House committee and then again before the Senate committee. His words were very clear and convincing. I should like to read them into the RECORD at this point. They appear at page 9756 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 8, 1951. Admiral Sherman was answering questions of Representative MAHON:

Mr. MAHON. Against that kind of background are we taking necessary steps to prepare ourselves for the possibilities of a general war?

Admiral SHERMAN. We are engaged in a program, as I see it, which is designed to improve our state of readiness and build up to a level which we can sustain.

Now, if general war comes, of course, we can accelerate it. We can build up to higher levels.

On the other hand, if we believe, as I do, that we are facing an opponent who does not want a general war now, but who wants to do everything possible to exhaust us, to drain off our energies in a small operation here and a small operation there, induce us to do things that will impair our economy, then we have to face the fact we are in an operation which may become an endurance contest; therefore, it is wise to achieve the level of military strength which we can sustain over a period years. The worst thing that could happen to us, as I see it, would be to go to a full-out mobilization and not have a fight and then go into a period of cut-back

trying to save money and pay our debts, and then suddenly find ourselves in a fight.

There in a few words is the most lucid and most explicit explanation of the program which is guiding the Government in this crisis. It is this exact program of which Mr. Wilson, the head of defense mobilization, speaks when he refers to devoting 20 percent of the production of the Nation to defense.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes, indeed.

Mr. WHERRY. I appreciate very much the observations which have been made by the distinguished Senator in regard to the need for national defense.

At this moment, regardless of the merits of the case—and I believe the Senator feels very strongly, as I do, that emphasis should at least be placed on air power—

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Absolutely.

Mr. WHERRY. I am trying to find out the impact upon the economy for the fiscal year 1952. If all the expenditures and the carry-overs were utilized as intended, plus the appropriations for 1952 which are carried in the pending bill \$37,955,000,000 would be added to the corrected figure for the \$44,278,000,000, which is now \$36,004,000,000, which would mean in the neighborhood of approximately \$74,000,000,000, or fairly close to that figure. The additional appropriations carried in this bill, which include \$23,148,621,000, would have to be added to the figure I have just stated. So by the end of 1953, without making further appropriations, the Defense Establishment would have, either by way of appropriations authorized or expenditures which may be made from the expenditure budget, the additional amount of \$23,000,000,000, thus making the total amount come fairly close to \$100,000,000,000, I believe.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I say to the Senator from Nebraska that all that money could not possibly be expended during the fiscal year 1952, for the reason that this budget contains cash appropriations for the building, let us say, of airplanes which will take 24 months to build. By virtue of making the appropriation, the Department of the Air Force can make its contract after this bill has been enacted. Let us say that the contract is made on the first day of October, 1951. Then the payment could not possibly be made until October 1953, and therefore that payment would not have its impact upon the economy in the fiscal year 1952. That arrangement goes all through the budget.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand that, and I think it is a fair explanation, except it means that through the system of appropriations and cash expenditures we are now using, the military do not have to come back to the Congress for additional appropriations, as the military formerly did under the contract-authority arrangement. So what is actually being done—and I think this should be pointed out, and I appreciate the Senator's frankness—is that we have not only an expenditures budget, in connection with this appropriation bill, of nearly \$38,000,000,000, but also a carry-over,

which at least was supposed to be expended during this fiscal year, of nearly \$37,000,000,000, plus the present appropriation of \$23,148,000,000, all to be carried over into 1953, thus being, in other words, a bookkeeping account of nearly \$100,000,000,000, which the military will have to spend in 1952 and in the fiscal year 1953. Is not that correct?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes, it is correct. That money is available for expenditure during these 2 years. It now is clear that all the money cannot possibly be expended during the first fiscal year. The table I read showed that the very best estimates which have been made would indicate that all the money could not possibly be spent during the first fiscal year; and even though we have added \$5,000,000,000 by the unanimous will of the committee, to expand the Nation's air power, so that the United States may be ready, and the whole world may know it is ready, to carry the war implements to any aggressor, anywhere upon the face of the earth.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I should like to answer, if I may do so without interfering.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Massachusetts never interferes. He always adds to the information and intelligence and illumination of the audience. I am very glad to have the Senator from Massachusetts respond to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Before he does, I should like to say that there are two other things about which I wish to ask.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall be here.

Mr. WHERRY. For the sake of continuity, I think they should be stated now.

The first is this: Will there be any supplemental appropriations, in addition to this appropriation? I speak now inasmuch as the committee included the so-called Maybank amendment, and I should like to know about it. Does it end the contemplated increase and expansion of our air power?

In the second place, are there included in this measure any appropriations for Korea; or are any such appropriations to be anticipated, so that they would have to be added to the 1952 budget or to any other budget?

I should like to obtain from the chairman of the committee, if I can, his best judgment as to the total actual expenditures for 1952 and the total actual appropriations which will be made in 1952, to be used either in 1952 or 1953, so that we shall have before the Members of the Senate, the combined figure, with all the items included in the one figure, if that is possible.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Last week the Senate passed the public works military authorization bill. As I recall, that bill authorized the expenditure of \$5,300,000,000—

Mr. STENNIS. \$5,700,000,000, I believe.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Mississippi corrects me by saying that bill authorized the expenditure of \$5,700,000,000. Of course, that probably will ripen into some form of a supple-

mental appropriation bill before this session is over. I understand that the House committee is beginning hearings upon it this week, perhaps today.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator anticipate the provision of cash expenditures from that bill for this year, perhaps?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think there will be some, but I do not know how much. I am frank to say to the Senator that I reserve my judgment about many of those authorizations.

The Senator from Mississippi advises me that he thinks a request will be made for an appropriation of approximately \$4,000,000,000, but not all of it can be spent in the fiscal year 1952.

Let me answer further by saying that in the pending bill there is no appropriation for money for Korea.

Mr. WHERRY. Where are we getting the money for that war, and what is the Senator's best judgment as to what will be required?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. But the bill does include money for the subsistence of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force; and the money for subsistence and the money for clothing and the money for all the normal, day-to-day expenditures provided by this bill will be expended wherever the military establishment may be operated. So to that extent this bill does finance operations in Korea. However, in Korea we are consuming matériel which was purchased and accumulated before this time; in fact, some of it was inventory lasting over from World War II. That is being used, and I have no doubt that by January there will be a supplemental bill based upon the idea that this inventory should be replaced.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator have any conception, through evidence he has heard or conversations with the military chiefs, in regard to a minimum figure in respect to how much would be required?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should say that, if we were going to restore the entire inventory which has been expended in any year, it probably would take about \$4,000,000,000; it might be more.

Mr. WHERRY. I have heard the figure of \$5,400,000,000 stated as the minimum, and from that on up.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No, that was the maximum, and that was based upon a continued operation.

Mr. WHERRY. So that it would be safe to say that, in addition to the amount we have mentioned, of nearly \$100,000,000,000, there must be taken into account also whatever supplemental appropriation may come up in connection with the public-works bill, for cash expenditures, now estimated at around \$4,000,000,000; and then, if a bill making appropriations for the Korean War comes before the House before the year is over, it also will have to be taken into account.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. And these all amount to a round figure which we say is the 1952 defense bill, in order that we may get the complete picture.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; but always with the qualification that the expenditures will not keep pace with the appropriations.

Mr. WHERRY. But the things will have to be paid for some time.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, yes, indeed.

Mr. WHERRY. So that if the impact does not come this year, we will have it next year, or possibly the following year.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. We should not hesitate to make it clear to the Congress and to the country that we are engaged on a terribly expensive program. The dollars which we are appropriating are being provided for the purpose of preserving the system of individual freedom. In my judgment dollars alone will not win this war; it will require the spirit of America to win it and the realization that we are engaged in a life-and-death struggle with a totalitarian power which believes it is launching itself upon world conquest.

Mr. WHERRY. With the terrific amount of \$100,000,000,000 in 1952, or, let us say, with an average of \$100,000,000,000 in 1952 and \$100,000,000,000 in 1953, does the Senator, who is a member of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, and who has studied the economic problems, believe our economy would stand the impact, in the absence of a complete regimentation of our people?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am hoping it can be done.

Mr. WHERRY. Of course, we are all hoping; but what is the Senator's judgment?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In my judgment it can be done, if we win the cold war; but if we were thrown into a third world war, then I think that everything we stand for would be in jeopardy.

Mr. WHERRY. Of course, if we get into a third world war, everything will be in jeopardy. What I am asking the distinguished Senator for is his opinion and judgment, based upon the studies of the joint committee on the economic report, with respect to the impact of this terrific inflation in our own country, upon our own economy. I am asking the distinguished Senator how he feels regarding the bills about which we are now talking, and about the past bills. I still have ideas about where priorities should be applied in this defense bill, though I think they are not being applied in that way. But, regardless of that, with inflation at its present point, and with practically \$100,000,000,000 added, in 1952, because we must pay the bills, or carry them over into 1953, with another big expenditure in 1953, does not the Senator feel that there will be a terrific impact upon the economy of this country?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course there will be a terrific impact; I agree with the Senator completely. The Joint Committee on the Economic Report only a month ago issued its unanimous report pointing out that inflation is still a danger. There can be no question about that.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Perhaps it would be helpful, in connection with the figures which have been referred to in the colloquy between the Senator from Nebraska and the Senator from Wyoming, to call attention to page 19 of the budget for the Defense Department for the fiscal year 1952. On that page it is shown that, in round figures, the total expenditures this year from prior-year authorizations would be \$18,400,000,000, and, from 1952 authorizations, \$21,000,000,000, or a total, in round figures, of \$39,000,000,000.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator refer to the expenditures for this year?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I refer to the expenditures for the fiscal year 1952.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That will mean that, of the \$36,000,000,000 which is carried over, only \$18,400,000,000 will be expended in 1952, and another \$18,000,000,000 out of prior-year appropriations will be carried over into 1953 and 1954; and, of the \$61,000,000,000, if it is all appropriated, only \$21,000,000,000 will be spent this year, and approximately \$40,000,000,000 would be carried over, with whatever Congress may add to it next year.

Those figures, of course, do not include the \$4,000,000,000 for public works and the \$5,000,000,000-plus for Korea, which have been mentioned. In other words, prior-year appropriations will not all be spent this year; they will be continued and carried forward, as will this year's appropriation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course, it should always be borne in mind that in the figures which we give, we are talking in terms of estimates. The figures in the budget report, from which I think the Senator was reading, were prepared in January. The figures which I read from the report of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report were prepared only a little over a month ago; so that the figures change from time to time.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not also a fact that the amount to be spent will depend upon the capacity of the industries to produce the various articles which are needed? That is the determining factor as to the amount which will be carried over, is it not?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is quite right. No one knows better than does the Senator from Michigan the lag there has been with respect to machine tools. That has not been overcome, though it is certainly now in the process of being overcome.

Mr. FERGUSON. Whether it is overcome will determine really the amount which will be spent this year and in the ensuing years, will it not?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Exactly.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am very happy to yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Washington has noted with keen distress that the committee has found it necessary to

delete section 604 (b) of the bill, which deals with the release of inactive and volunteer reservists. The reference to this question begins at the bottom of page 6 of the report. I continue to be very much dismayed that so much of the fighting in the Korean War is required to be done by young Americans who have already seen too much fighting and who have seen too much of war, as the result of their experience and service in the late global conflict. With that observation, I desire to ask the Senator a question.

Short of all-out global war, the committee does not expect any branch of the armed services to call any more men involuntarily into service who have had 12 months' service during World War II.

My question is, What does that language actually mean?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is, in terms, a very insistent suggestion to the armed services that they shall not call men who had World War II service.

Mr. CAIN. Do the Senator from Wyoming and his colleagues on the committee have reason to believe that no branch of the armed services, as of this time, is continuing to call into the service men who had 12 months' service in World War II?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; I am satisfied that the Department of Defense is ready to follow that program. The Department of Defense, and particularly the Army, set up a program of rotation which really ought to be most encouraging. The plan is to have at least 10,000 reservists out of the armed services by December.

When the hearing was held, the reports showed that on July 31 of this year 36,935 combat personnel had already been rotated. The program is to bring these men back and distribute them to their homes. The Armed Services Committee, in studying this problem a year or so ago, and in reporting a bill for universal military training, in reporting the draft extension bill, and so forth, reduced the period of service to 17 months; and the testimony before us is clear that, under the system which is now in operation, the men who had World War service will probably lose not to exceed 2 months before rotation, or before they are out of the service, beyond that which would have been provided under the House provision.

The reason why the committee struck out section 604 (b) was that it was convinced that not to do so would seriously upset the organization and do a great deal of harm. Furthermore, the committee knew that replacements could be obtained only by getting other men who had had, perhaps, the same sort of service. So that, all in all, while the committee was meeting a situation which aroused the unanimous sympathy of its members, it was felt that the best thing to do was to let the present procedure continue.

Mr. CAIN. If the Senator will kindly permit me to make an observation and then ask one additional question, it appears to me that the Senator from Wyoming and a majority of his associates feel just as strongly as I do that the war

going on in Korea shall, to the greatest possible extent, be fought by young men of this war's generation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. CAIN. And that every inactive and active reservist ought to be gotten out of the service at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Absolutely.

Mr. CAIN. On the strength of the committee's report, would it be fair and reasonable for those of us who receive many letters on the subject to say that as of the date of the report of the committee it can fully be expected that no active or inactive reservist having had 12 months of service in World War II will be called to the conflict in Korea?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is the will of the committee; and if the bill is passed as the committee recommended, it will be the will of the Senate. I am satisfied from my conversations with officials of the Department of Defense that that will be their policy.

Mr. President, I should like to add another word. During the consideration of this measure by the Appropriations Committee I expressed to the committee my belief that we ought to undertake as a committee an investigation and check-up of the status of the armed services, and where they are, in Europe, in the United States, in Japan, and in Korea, so that there will not be any waste of the human resource which, after all, is our most valuable resource.

Mr. CAIN. I express my appreciation to the Senator from Wyoming and I desire to say that I think it is a true statement to make that literally thousands of Americans who served well in the last war will derive a considerable amount of satisfaction from what has just been expressed by the Senator from Wyoming in speaking broadly not only for his committee, but for a majority of the Senate. I myself am very grateful for the Senator's explanation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Washington is always very kind.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I, too, should like to express my appreciation of the splendid statement which the Senator from Wyoming has just made in regard to our active and inactive reservists. Can the Senator give us any assurance as to when the inactive or involuntary reservists can expect to be discharged from the service?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The process is going on all the time, and the number of reservists discharged is mounting every month.

Mr. CARLSON. That is a very encouraging statement, and I sincerely trust the process will be stepped up, if possible. During the debate on the military manpower bill, on February 27, I interrogated the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], who had charge of the bill, in regard to the release of inactive reservists and those who were called involuntarily into the service. He read from the committee report and made a statement which will be found on page 1627 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 27, 1951.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this brief colloquy between the distinguished Senator from Texas and myself may be made a part of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the colloquy was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. CARLSON. * * * However, I ask the Senator if he will be so kind as to permit me to ask him another question respecting another component part of our military organization which, I believe, has not been mentioned this afternoon. I refer to the Reserve. I do not believe there is a Member of this body who has not been disappointed, at least, by the way the Reserve program has been handled by the military authorities. In fact, I think it has been so poorly handled as to be disgraceful. But regardless of that, we are faced with the situation of dealing with Reserve. Did the committee consider that problem, or did it not take action upon it?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The committee not only considered it, but notified the Department of Defense and notified the Senate, on page 56 of the report, in the following words:

"The committee recognizes that our Reserve program since World War II has not been adequate or realistic. We have requested that the necessary corrective action be taken and have received assurances that a new program is being prepared by the Department of Defense and will be submitted in the near future."

The chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the very able junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], has announced that the Armed Services Committee will go into the whole question very thoroughly; and we hope that in a matter of weeks we shall be giving consideration to that question.

Mr. CARLSON. I thank the Senator from Texas for that encouraging statement.

Mr. CARLSON. I understand from the Senator from Wyoming that results are being secured, so far as the release of inactive reservists is concerned.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. CARLSON. And that no involuntary reservists who have served 12 months or more in World War II are going to be called.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. As I said to the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], that is certainly the will of the committee; and if the Senate passes the bill, it will be the will of the Senate. I think it will be adhered to.

Mr. CARLSON. I sincerely hope that is true, I will be watching to see how sincere the Joint Chiefs of Staff are. I have received letters, as has every other Senator, probably, from men who have served several years. They do not feel they have received proper consideration and in fact neither do I. Last week I received a letter from a man who had served 5 years. The young men, when they were discharged from service in World War II, felt they had been assured if they signed as reservists they would not be recalled into service unless we were in an actual all-out war. The administration calls this a police action. So I think it is very important that the military authorities do everything within their power to secure replacements for these men so an early release can be given these reservists who have already given so much.

I appreciate the statement which the Senator made as to the difficulty involved if we should demand immediate release. I feel that with the assurance given today we can feel a little better about the situation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, it seems appropriate at this time that I make a slight reference to the consideration which is being given to our resources.

There have been great gains in preventive medicine, under the research and development program carried out through the medical branch of the armed services. Great gains have already been achieved. The facts are that in World War II, 44 men out of every 1,000 were off duty every day because of injury or illness. That was a vast improvement over the situation in World War I, when the rate was 58 out of every 1,000 men. The testimony before our committee shows that the present time only 39 men out of every 1,000 are so incapacitated. In terms of manpower, this means that on the average day there are now 6,500 fewer troops off duty because of illness or injury than there would have been had the World War II rate prevailed.

Our medical service has succeeded in conquering diseases which are sometimes epidemic in Korea, such as typhoid, smallpox, even tetanus. Because of the efficient care of the Medical Corps and the Armed Services' educational programs there have been only sporadic cases of these diseases among our men. They have been immunized against them. But, Mr. President, more important, even, than that, is the progress we have achieved in caring for wounded soldiers. For example, of the 1,000 battle casualties receiving medical treatment facilities, 975 can now be expected to live. This is almost twice the survival expectancy of the wounded during World War II. Not only have we had this great gain, but the Armed Services have established an educational and informational service which is bringing a new degree of education to the men who are in the Armed Services.

The figures which have been presented to me indicate, as I recall, that some 1,500 or 1,600 men who entered the Army without having finished the fifth grade, have now finished the fifth grade by taking advantage as volunteers of the educational facilities made available to them. There are mobile units which carry textbooks, newspapers, and magazines, sometimes almost up to the very front lines. One of these mobile units is equipped with a shower, so that the men may come from the field, go to the mobile unit, wash the grime and dirt of battle away, and turn to their books—and they are turning to them. But the most extraordinary thing to me was the fact that as compared with 15,029 soldiers who completed their fifth year of education during the fiscal year 1951, 5,365 men completed the eight grade, and 28,852 received high-school diplomas. So the United States Department of Defense is having consideration for the health and the minds of the men

who are serving in the military forces.

On the table before me I have a photograph of one of the new training devices used by the Air Force. They call it a simulator. It was displayed to the members of the committee. In this device the pilots of the new, highly technical airplanes receive their training on the ground. Every possible condition of flight is simulated in this machine, even to the icing upon the wings of the airplane. There is economy in the use of this machine, because it results in a training cost of \$25 per man per hour as compared with a cost of not less than \$50 per man per hour if the training takes place in the plane, to say nothing of the danger to the plane.

Mr. President, I have taken considerably more time than I intended to take. I am sorry that it is not possible to bring secret weapons to the Chamber to exhibit them to the Members of the Senate. I do not like to talk about secret weapons, certainly not so long as the representatives of Tass have freedom of access to press conferences and even to the press gallery.

Members of the Senate will be interested, however, in looking at some of the objects on the desk before me. What I have just picked up is almost a flying disk. It is a new carrier for gasoline. It is made of synthetic rubber. It carries about five gallons of gasoline. It is now in use. It can be dropped to a tank or to any other vehicle using gasoline or other fuel, and it has been dropped from heights of from 200 to, I believe, 1,000 feet.

The research and development program has developed at least 200 new items which were not used in World War II, and which are now available for use in the fighting. Even in Korea we have the new Patton tank which, as I recall, General Collins told us, has a record of knocking out a ratio of 18 to 1 in combat with Russian tanks operated perhaps by North Koreans, perhaps by Communist Chinese.

The superior capacity of the American fighting man, which was so clearly demonstrated during World War II, is again being demonstrated, and we are supplying him with all sorts of new implements of warfare which science and technology can devise.

Mr. President, I have spent more time on this statement, which I intended to be brief, than I had in mind when I opened, but I am sure that Members of the Senate might be interested in looking over what is on the table before me.

Here we have a new walkie-talkie, for example, which is now in use. It has to be carried by the infantryman. It weighs 25 pounds as compared with a weight of about 45 pounds of the similar instrument used during World War II.

We have new land mines which are available, which are so devised that they are very difficult to detect.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. I am sure we are all greatly impressed by the Senator's explanation of these new muniments of war he has referred to, and also impressed by the tremendous costs which are involved in producing them. May I ask what study has the committee given to the costs of the weapons or devices now being discussed? Are such matters as patents involved in the costs, or are there other details which would go to make them tremendously expensive? I understood the Senator to say that one instrument cost \$250,000. What has been done by the committee to determine whether the costs involved are reasonable?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The committee has investigated and learned with great interest that the renegotiation program will function with respect to all these instruments, so that a constant surveillance will be maintained to make sure that the costs are not excessive. Of course, inflation takes its toll here. Inflation increases the cost of defense just as it increases the cost of living.

Mr. MURRAY. In making the original contract is any study given to whether or not patents are involved upon the basis of which there will be excessive costs?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; every such factor is taken into consideration. I requested the Department to submit to us for the record a complete statement of the patent problem. The Senator from Montana will find it in the record. I do not have the page at the moment, but I shall advise him what it is later on.

Mr. MURRAY. The Senator also stated that we cannot win the contest we are engaged in by dollars alone. I am sure the Senator approves of the stepped up program of the Voice of America as one way of meeting the world problem and the threat of Communist imperialism which is upon us.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, I think we should do everything that is humanly possible to win the minds of the people of the world. We are in a cold war with a ruthless and tyrannical dictatorship which plans a world conquest. It is seeking to convince the peoples of the world that the United States of America desires to step into the imperial shoes of the empires of the past. That is not the case. We know it is not the case. I think we should leave nothing undone to convey to the minds of the people of the whole world that we have no purpose of conquest; that we seek only to lead the whole world to peace. For that reason I think we should use every new device that is possible.

Mr. MURRAY. In other words, we are not depending upon dollars alone, or the power of military machines alone. We are depending also upon the principle that the world should come to understand what our democratic system of free enterprise means. We are not seeking to take anything from any other country in the world, but we are willing to help them attain the standards which we have in this country.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is my belief, which I have stated over and over

again, that we here in America should use every energy to fight the war against inflation in the United States, so as to protect our economy and enable us to make contributions toward winning the economic war here.

A few weeks ago I engaged in a radio discussion with the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON]. I think we were in complete agreement. The Senator from Michigan said that it was too bad that some people seemed to think that a profit was to be made out of this program. I am convinced that no profit can be made out of it; nor should any profit be made. We ought to devote our every effort to making the sacrifices which are necessary to bring about the desired result.

Mr. MURRAY. I appreciate the statement of the Senator.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, if there are no further questions—

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I have a question, if the Senator has completed his general statement.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have.

Mr. FERGUSON. I refer to page 70, line 12, of the bill, where reference is made to gratuities offered by contractors to representatives of the Government. Would it not be well to add, after the word "offered" the words "or paid"?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think the Senator is quite right. When we come to that amendment I shall be very glad to accept it.

Mr. FERGUSON. There might be a case in which a demand was made for such a gratuity. The contractor might pay it and then say to the court and jury that there was no offer.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am very glad to have the Senator bring out that point.

Mr. FERGUSON. There is one further item to which I wish to refer. I realize that in committee reports the desire of the Congress may be indicated, even though specific language is not inserted in a bill. I am sure it is clear from page 7 of the report that it is the feeling of the committee that no one who is a volunteer reservist should be taken into the service unless it is really necessary, nor should he remain in the service any longer than is necessary for the good of the service and the country.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is our feeling. I did not refer to this point during the previous discussion of the question, but the Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives is presently engaged in a legislative study of this problem, and I think our own Armed Services Committee is likewise so engaged.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator realizes how complicated a procedure it is to make up a chart of the services, and to take reservists out of the service under specific language in the law. However, merely because the Senate is removing the Van Zandt amendment should not indicate that it is not in sympathy with the idea and does not expect the plan to be carried out as soon as possible under the law.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The committee was completely in sympathy with the purpose of the amendment. We removed

it only because we were convinced that it would do more harm than good by reason of the disruptive effect it would have upon our military organization.

Mr. FERGUSON. If we placed certain language in the statute, it would be absolutely mandatory, and no matter what the consequences were to the service, it would have to be obeyed.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. It was the intention of the committee, according to the language of the report, that the desired purpose should be accomplished if it could be done without doing violence to the service.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is quite right.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. As I recall, we were assured by the defense authorities that the average time under the 17-month provision would be 14 months.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. There would be some who would have to be kept in for the full 17 months, but on the average they would be released after 14 months.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is quite correct.

JAPANESE PEACE TREATY

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I do not wish to delay the Senate at this time, but having just returned from the Japanese Peace Treaty at San Francisco, I wish to express a personal viewpoint on my responsibility as a United States Senator.

I believe that the United States and the free world gained the initiative at the San Francisco Conference, and took the diplomatic initiative from the Soviet Union. I believe that the Soviet Union suffered one of its greatest diplomatic defeats at the San Francisco Conference. I hope that nothing will be done which will prevent the free world and the United States from maintaining the diplomatic initiative which we now have. For that reason I am very hopeful that the treaty may be ratified at an early date. If it is not feasible for the treaty to be brought up for ratification prior to the scheduled adjournment date of October 1, or if there are some practical problems in the way of bringing it up before that date, since the Senate alone is the body which acts on treaty ratifications, I hope the Senate may be called back into session prior to January 3, at some time to be agreed upon, so that we can ratify the treaty, continue the leadership of the free world, and give encouragement to the other 48 nations which have signed the treaty at San Francisco, so that they too may proceed with the ratification.

In other words, now that we have the diplomatic ball, we should continue to hold it and not fumble it. We should keep the Soviet Union on the defensive from now on.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am very much gratified by the statement of the Senator from California. I should like to ask if it was his impression that the American delegates, particularly John Foster Dulles and Secretary Acheson, handled themselves well at the conference.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the Senator from Illinois without any mental reservation whatever that I think the entire American delegation—Secretary of State Acheson, Mr. Dulles, and our senatorial representatives who were present—handled themselves in a superb manner. I believe that fairness and equity would require me to say that the job which Secretary Acheson did in presiding over the conference was outstanding.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I ask if the Senator from California noticed any tendency on the part of the Secretary of State to be overly tender toward the Russian delegate, Mr. Gromyko?

Mr. KNOWLAND. No. As I have just pointed out, I think he handled himself in a superb manner as the presiding officer of the conference. I think there was a clear indication of the closest type of bipartisan cooperation. The President of the United States, Mr. Acheson, and the representatives of other nations quite properly gave much of the credit for this treaty to Mr. John Foster Dulles. While I myself had no official connection with the meeting, I will say that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], who were present in an official capacity, cooperated fully. To them also goes a considerable share of the credit for what I think has been a great diplomatic victory on the part of the free world.

Mr. DOUGLAS. As one Member of the Senate, I thank the Senator from California for his very excellent speech, which rises above party. I think it is a very eloquent testimonial on certain matters.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Does not the Senator from California believe that one of the finest things of all was the telegram which John Foster Dulles sent to Gen. Douglas MacArthur?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes. I think the telegram which Mr. Dulles sent to General MacArthur was well deserved. I believe everyone who has any knowledge of the Japanese Treaty recognizes the fact that long ago General MacArthur felt that the time had come for a peace treaty to be put into effect between Japan, the United States, and the other powers which had been at war.

Personally, I regret very much that General MacArthur was not one of the American delegates at the Peace Conference in San Francisco. I believe, however, the telegram which Mr. Dulles sent to General MacArthur gave full recognition to the splendid work which General MacArthur had done, both in help-

ing the rehabilitation of Japan and in changing that nation of 80,000,000 former enemies into what we hope and believe will be a supporter of the free nations of the world.

Mr. LANGER. Did it not seem to the distinguished Senator from California that the telegram was unusually well worded?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes; I believe it was very well worded and very well deserved.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes.

Mr. MAYBANK. I merely wanted to note the fact that among the distinguished delegates who attended the San Francisco conference was a South Carolinian, who, as a member and as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House has worked untiringly in behalf of the betterment of our foreign relations. I refer to Representative RICHARDS, of South Carolina.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina that I did not mean to overlook any of the Members of the House. However, since I was making a very brief report to the Senate I covered only our colleagues. Certainly the Members of the House who attended the conference were very helpful in the work of the conference.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5054) making appropriations for the National Security Council, the National Security Resources Board, and for military functions administered by the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the committee amendments.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. There is one further matter, with reference to which I should like to inquire of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, who is handling the bill on the floor of the Senate. My inquiry has to do with the question of chauffeurs, which the committee discusses at page 5 of the report. I am certain that the fact that no amendment has been proposed so far on the reduction of the number of chauffeurs in the Military Establishment is not due to the fact that the subcommittee did not feel that there was an excess number of chauffeurs in the Department of Defense, but rather that the subcommittee feels the question is one of very vital importance, and an investigation and a survey should be made to determine where chauffeurs are essential and necessary and where they are really surplusage, and therefore the subcommittee did not insist upon inserting in the bill a provision which would reduce the chauffeurs to a certain number. Is that a correct statement?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is quite correct. I am glad to be able to

say to him that it is my intention, as a Member of the Senate, to introduce a bill, which will be referred to the Committee on Armed Services, to serve as the basis for just such a study. The bill I have in mind would deny to any retired officer an automobile or chauffeur at Government expense, except while on active duty for the Government. I believe the idea of furnishing chauffeurs in a very broad and generous manner for nongovernmental purposes ought to be corrected. I believe the Armed Service Committee, a legislative committee, is the committee which ought to make the study, because many of the officers who receive such privileges do so under existing law.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does not the Senator from Wyoming also feel that the persons in charge of the three services should be apprised as a part of the official record, that the committee feels there is an excess number of chauffeurs, and some action should be taken in the coming year, in addition to an investigation being made?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, yes; that was discussed fully with the representatives of the Secretary of Defense. I am quite confident that steps will be taken to carry out the program referred to in the report, and perhaps it may even be carried further.

I am sure that the general plan will be to handle the automobiles under a pooling system, and that throughout the country, at the various stations and camps, studies will be undertaken to police the use of automobiles, so that there may be no abuse in that respect.

Mr. President, I ask that the bill be read for committee amendments.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. GEORGE. The question may have been covered in the Senator's general statement and explanation, but I was not able to be present at the time. Did the Senator's general statement cover the present unexpended balances to the credit of all the services and agencies for all the purposes covered in the pending bill?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Mr. GEORGE. Does the Senator from Wyoming know approximately what those unexpended balances are?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes. A statement of them is contained in the report.

Mr. GEORGE. I shall be very glad to refer to the report.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Georgia will find the information at page 2 of the report.

Mr. GEORGE. They are considerable in the aggregate?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, yes. The committee was very careful to go into the problem of carry-overs and expenditures. We put into the record the tables which were prepared by the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, showing that fact. We have amended the bill to make it clear that the cash appropriations which cannot be expended in 1952 will be expended in future years, the purpose being to make sure that the inflationary impact will

not be so great as would appear, and also to make it clear that the revenues of the Government for a single year would not be needed to carry the burden of the expenditures. So, members of the Committee on Finance, of which the distinguished Senator from Georgia is the efficient chairman, will know that while we appropriate \$61,000,000,000 plus in the pending bill, \$23,148,000,000 cannot possibly be expended during 1952, and perhaps not all of the \$37,900,000,000, which is set down for fiscal 1952.

Mr. GEORGE. My second question related to that particular point. I assume that the report shows, and that the Senator's address covered, the estimated expenditures which will be made by the armed services out of prior appropriations and from this appropriation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Mr. GEORGE. During this fiscal year.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is set forth, and I shall amplify it.

Mr. GEORGE. I would appreciate it if the Senator would do so, because I was unable to be on the floor, and I should like to be able to vote advisedly. It is obvious that all the money carried in the bill and all the money appropriated in the bill, together with the contract authorities, if such are contained in the bill, could not be expended during this fiscal year.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. First let me say to the able Senator from Georgia that the bill does contain contract authority.

Mr. GEORGE. It does not?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is all cash. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point in my remarks the table from which I quoted, which is found at page 1482 of the hearings. The table was prepared by the Joint Committee on the Economic Report.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE I.—*Authorizations, total funds available, and administrative budget expenditures for Defense Department military functions, actual fiscal year 1951, estimated 1952-56*

(Billions of dollars)					
Fiscal year	Brought forward from prior years	Net new authority	Total funds available	Budget expenditures	Carry-over to following year
1951.....	9.4	47.6	57.0	19.2	37.8
1952.....	37.8	60.7	98.5	40.0	58.5
1953.....	58.5	45.0	103.5	55.5	48.0
1954.....	48.0	35.0	83.0	50.0	33.0
1955.....	33.0	35.0	68.0	40.0	28.0
1956.....	28.0	35.0	63.0	35.0	28.0

Mr. GEORGE. I thank the Senator. Mr. FERGUSON and Mr. DOUGLAS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). Does the Senator yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield first to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I merely wish to ask the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee with reference to page 1

of the report. I note the following words:

It was deemed desirable, in order to make clear that the total sum appropriated will not flow into the stream of purchasing power during fiscal year 1952, to make a clear distinction in the bill between these two categories of expenditure.

That refers to appropriations and expenditures. In speaking about inflation, is it not correct to say that competition for goods will also create pressures for inflation?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course that is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. If contracts are let to contractors and contractors let subcontracts to subcontractors, pressures can be brought about by a demand for goods to fill the orders, just as if the expenditures had actually been made, and we do not avoid inflationary pressures by merely not spending the money. The letting of contracts is also an inflationary pressure, is it not?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is quite correct. Of course, that is the reason for the system of allocations of scarce materials, which is being administered under the general direction of Mr. Charles E. Wilson.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLEMENTS in the chair). Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The fact that we set them apart in the reference, in order to indicate how much will be expended this year and how much will go into the economic blood stream after this year, prevents anyone from receiving a false impression to the effect that this entire amount of appropriations will be spent this year, thus stimulating the economic activity of the country during this year, does it not?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct, and I am glad the Senator from Arkansas has made that statement.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I appreciate the Senator's courtesy in yielding to me.

On page 2 of the report I notice the statement that the latest estimate of actual cash expenditures during the fiscal year 1952 is \$39,284,000,000, which in turn is divided in the ways there stated.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Earlier today I stated that that figure includes a typographical error made in the computation by the Department of Defense.

The Senator is referring to the last table, is he?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I am referring to the bottom of page 2.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes, the second table, I believe.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Very well. What is the question?

Mr. MILLIKIN. My question is, first, in view of the Senator's remarks, is that the figure which is estimated?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes, it is an estimate of expenditures.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Does it include certain amounts for public works which have military significance?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No, it does not.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Will that be approximately \$4,000,000,000?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The original estimate was \$4,500,000,000, but it was not included in this bill. This bill includes only a very small amount—\$102,000,000, as I recall—for public works.

The bill the Senate passed last week authorizes \$5,877,000,000—I believe that is the correct figure—for public works. Today the hearings are beginning on the part of the House committee. My best advice from the members of the Armed Services Committee is that recommendations probably not exceeding \$4,500,000,000 or \$5,000,000,000 will be made.

Mr. MILLIKIN. On the whole, would those be closely connected with the military?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, yes; all of them are.

Mr. MILLIKIN. All of them are?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Does the figure \$39,284,000,000 include allowance for expenditures for Korea?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, yes; it includes all expenditures that will be made.

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is in the figure \$39,284,000,000, is it?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The approximately \$5,000,000,000 for public works is the amount of an appropriation in addition to the \$61,000,000,000 we are making available in this bill, plus the \$44,000,000,000 that is a carry-over from previous appropriations, all of which will bring the total amount of the appropriations, together with the \$5,000,000,000 of public works carried in this bill and in a previous bill, to approximately \$110,000,000,000, in round numbers.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That probably would be the cash available; I think the Senator's figures probably are correct, assuming that the \$5,000,000,000 will be appropriated. My advice is that the Department will not ask for more than \$4,500,000,000.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes; it probably will be a little less than \$5,000,000,000. However, in round numbers the total probably will be approximately \$110,000,000,000.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I had already promised to yield to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If the Senator from Vermont will permit me to ask a question first, in connection with the recent questions asked by the Senator from Colorado, I shall appreciate it very much.

Mr. AIKEN. Certainly.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In view of the courtesy of the Senator from Vermont, I am glad to yield now to the Senator from Massachusetts, to permit him to ask a question.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have already asked whether the \$39,000,000,000 figure includes expenditures for Korea. It is my understanding that nothing for Korea is included in the budget estimates.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I understand that the expenditures figure which was given to the Senator from Wyoming by the Armed Forces does not include anything for Korea.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me point out to the Senator that every soldier, every marine, every airman, and every naval person, including both officers and enlisted personnel, now on service in Korea is receiving his pay, his subsistence, and his equipage, and the like; and appropriations for all of that is carried in this bill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. However, is it not true that certain provisions must be made for equipment which is used up?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course, matériel is being consumed now, as I pointed out earlier today. What may be the decision of Congress with respect to replacing such expended inventories, I shall not now pretend to guess.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Wyoming would not be willing to make a guess or an estimate about that now. Is that correct?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No, I would not guess about it now. Perhaps we would not need to make such a provision.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. But the figure which has been bandied about—let us put it that way—

Mr. O'MAHONEY. However, it has nothing to do with the question which was asked by the Senator from Colorado, who was asking about expenditures during 1952. I say to him that the figures before us now give the closest possible estimate we can obtain at this time, taking everything into consideration in regard to what expenditures will be made by us for operations in Korea, in Europe, and elsewhere during the fiscal year 1952. Expenditures may be speeded up. I do not know; no one can guess. We may wish to spend some money to replace some of the ammunition which is being shot away and some of the tanks which are being destroyed; but much of that will be provided by the items contained in this bill, because it provides for building new tanks.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Will the Senator from Wyoming yield for another question while the Senator from Colorado is in the Chamber? I think it is important to give the Senator from Colorado all the information we can. This thought was running through my mind: A supplemental request is expected either in October or in January, presumably. We have been told that in open session. Has the Senator any idea whether any of that money, comparatively little of which will be expended this year, I believe, may be expended in addition to the amounts provided in this measure?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have said to the representatives of the Department of Defense that in my judgment any supplemental bill of that kind can well await the next session of Congress, because it is not needed now. This bill appropriates sufficient money to carry on operations at full scale until the next session of Congress, with the exception of the money which may be needed to build the public works which were authorized in the bill passed a few days ago.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As one Senator on this side of the aisle, I sincerely hope the Senator from Wyoming is correct. I hope no supplemental bill will be brought up at this session.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I will do my best to see that I am correct as to that.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President—

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Now I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I understand that the pending bill authorizes the placing of contracts for goods, materials, and services which may not be paid for until some years in the future. Am I correct as to that?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No, the Senator is not quite correct, as he has made the statement.

Mr. AIKEN. I am referring to the delivery of goods and services—

Mr. O'MAHONEY. This bill provides no contract authority, as we have ordinarily used that term. This bill contains provisions for cash. I have divided the proposed cash appropriations into two categories: first, those which are capable of being expended in 1952; second, those which cannot possibly be expended until 1953. I have made that division because many of the items we are building, such as huge planes and the aircraft carrier, cannot possibly be delivered in 1952, and therefore will not have to be paid for until months hence. However, in the bill we include cash appropriations for them, so that the contracts may be made and the obligations assumed, and so that the contractors may know that they have authority to proceed.

Mr. AIKEN. In the event the emergency becomes less acute and the need for the large expenditures abates somewhat, is there included in the bill a provision for cancellation of contracts?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is not necessary. The Congress has complete authority at any time to rescind an appropriation; and all the contracts which are being made contain, as I understand, provisions with respect to their termination in the event of a change of conditions.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator has already answered my next and last question; and I thank him.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Illinois has been seeking recognition.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I want to make some comments, after the Senator has yielded the floor.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Then, I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan listened with interest to the colloquy between the Senator from Mas-

sachusetts and the Senator from Wyoming, in regard to a supplemental bill. The Senator from Wyoming will recall that in the subcommittee, time after time, the question was raised as to whether this bill contained any provision for carrying on the Korean War. Does the Senator feel that if the truce is not effectuated, the Korean War can be carried on out of the \$39,284,000,000 of cash mentioned on page 2 of the report?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, I think if the truce does not become effective, if war is carried on at maximum proportions, as it ought to be in that case, expenditures of as much as \$5,000,000,000 might be necessary. But in my response to the Senator from Massachusetts I was merely calling attention to the difference between the day-to-day expenditures for a military force and the capital expenditures necessary for the procurement of long-peace-time items.

Mr. FERGUSON. I thought the RECORD ought to be rather clear relative to the Korean situation. As the Korean War has been conducted in the past, matériel has not been used, of course, in the way it would in an all-out war; but if the truce is not made, I think China and North Korea should understand that America really intends to push the conflict to an early conclusion, and that, if necessary, a supplemental bill for the required weapons and wherewithal in connection with the Korean situation will be forthcoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, yes. I am glad the Senator made that statement. I think it ought to be perfectly clear that the Korean War has been fought with a huge inventory of ammunition, of arms, and of matériel of every kind, which had been accumulated and saved over from the end of World War II, and that we are now producing a continuous stream of matériel to take the place of those munitions, arms, and matériel. Of course, it may be necessary eventually to make a supplemental appropriation. As the Senator from Michigan so well says, the Communist Chinese and the North Koreans must know that if there is not a cease-fire, the United States has the men and has the matériel, and has the most devastating weapons ever conceived, which can be delivered, if they want war. We hope they want peace.

Mr. President, I ask that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the amendments.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, before the Senator makes that request, will he yield for a brief observation?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, recently in another forum I had occasion to compliment the able and distinguished chairman of the subcommittee for the most thorough job which he did on the bill during the hearings. As a member of the subcommittee, I wish to make that statement for the record. Because of other committee responsibilities, I was unable to attend all the sessions of the subcommittee, but I may say for the record, and I am glad to say

for the record, that the able chairman, and the subcommittee, under his leadership, did as thorough and as competent a job in developing the facts upon which to base this appropriation as has been done in connection with any appropriation measure which it has been my pleasure to observe during its consideration.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is most gracious.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I merely desire to join in the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas. I have worked with the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, and I know the care and attention which, as chairman of the subcommittee, he has given and the fine service he has rendered, in connection with the pending bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am very appreciative, Mr. President.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me, that I may make those sentiments unanimous?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. As a member of the subcommittee of which the distinguished Senator from Wyoming is chairman, I want to associate myself with the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas and the distinguished Senator from Michigan, paying tribute to the very fine and able work which the Senator from Wyoming did on this bill. I know with what great care and fine intelligence he conducted the hearings, and how thoroughly and ably he considered the bill before submitting it to the Senate. I know that the bill contains very many constructive, statesmanlike suggestions which were written into it because of the fine thought and initiative and superior judgment of the Senator from Wyoming. He has done a very excellent job.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am most grateful for the statements of the Senator.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. HUNT. If I may, as the junior Senator from Wyoming, I should like to say to the Senators who have so highly complimented my colleague, the senior Senator from Wyoming, that I appreciate very greatly the sentiments expressed regarding him. Of course, I know, and have known for many years, the very splendid work which the senior Senator from Wyoming does on any piece of legislation which he undertakes to handle.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am overcome by the various statements which have been made, and it calls to my mind an oversight on my part. I have failed to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the witnesses who appeared before the subcommittee were, without exception, as cooperative and straightforward and lucid in their explanations of the various items of the bill as one could hope for. From Deputy Secretary Lovett down to the most junior lieutenant who appeared around

our committee table they were ready to respond to every question which was presented. I felt very, very much encouraged, Mr. President, by the spirit of efficiency and patriotism and devotion to duty which was displayed throughout these hearings by all the witnesses who appeared on behalf of the Department of Defense. And, of course, I cannot overlook the clerk of the subcommittee, Mr. Francis S. Hewitt, who sits beside me, handing me the answers to all the questions which are propounded. He worked quite as diligently as I or any other member of the committee, and I want him to understand that we appreciate his work.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, although not a member of the committee, yet merely as one Member of the Senate, I should like to join with the members of the committee in paying tribute to the senior Senator from Wyoming for the care and energy and fine public spirit which he showed, along with the other members of the committee. The size of the hearings, numbering some 1,900 pages, is testimony to some of the work performed; and that, I suppose, is really only the beginning of the story. There are a number of clauses which have been inserted in the bill which are an especial tribute to the Senator from Wyoming, notably, the clause which prohibits in the future contractors entertaining or improperly influencing officers of the supply services. I think that is a very excellent provision, and one which should be applied to all Government contractors and officials. It will remove one source of contamination, and will help to preserve the purity both of our military and civil service, and I think, in the long run, it will save the Government hundreds of millions and perhaps billions of dollars. So I do not wish to be outdone by my colleagues in paying tribute to the magnificent work which the Senator from Wyoming has done.

REDUCTIONS IN MILITARY BUDGET MUST NOT IMPAIR ARMED STRENGTH

Mr. President, one approaches the military budget with mingled feelings of awe and fright. It is the most important budget which can come before us in terms both of national defense and amount of money involved. I think every Member of this body, and certainly the senior Senator from Illinois, wants to have this country as strongly prepared as possible. I happen to be one who thinks that the ceiling of 3,500,000 men is perhaps too low, and that we should go above that ceiling. I think it is quite probable that we should go above the 95 air groups which the committee has recommended. I think we should have a larger Marine Corps, at least four divisions instead of two and one-third divisions.

So, Mr. President, I hope any remarks which I may make will not indicate any desire on my part for a smaller amount of preparedness. I believe, however, that we should scrutinize the budget very carefully, to ascertain whether we are paying too much for the degree of preparedness which is provided, whether the costs per man, per ship, per plane, per gun, are more than they might be

with proper management. My remarks will be devoted entirely to the point of efficiency and waste, not to any argument that we should reduce our armament, but to the possibility that we might get the same amount of strength with a smaller expenditure.

ONE-FIFTH OF OUR NATIONAL INCOME FOR DEFENSE

The figures which have been given to us today are, in a sense, staggering. They represent an appropriation of more than \$61,000,000,000, not all, of course, to be spent this year, but to be appropriated—\$61,000,000,000; one-fifth of our national income of around \$300,000,000,000. That will require the efforts of 13,000,000 men and women, or roughly one-fifth of the labor force, working all the year. It is truly a staggering figure.

Sixty-one billion dollars is equal to the total amount of money spent last year by the National and State Governments combined, because last year the National Government appropriated approximately \$43,000,000,000, and State and local governments \$18,000,000,000, making a total of \$61,000,000,000. We are now appropriating for defense alone one-fifth of the national income, and as large a total as was spent by all branches of government last year.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Illinois is using the word "expenditures"—

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thought I said "appropriations."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator referred to expenditures of more than \$61,000,000,000.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts. I meant "appropriations" and not "expenditures" of \$61,000,000,000.

TOTAL EXPENDITURES THIS YEAR LARGER THAN THIS BILL ALONE INDICATES

Mr. President, as the Senator from Wyoming has said, his committee estimates that roughly \$38,000,000,000 of dollars will actually be spent this year, but, as has been developed in the colloquy, this will not include expenditures under the \$4,900,000,000 military construction bill which we passed last week. It was also developed in the colloquy that it does not include any extraordinary expenses occasioned by the Korean War. The prospect of winding up that war in the near future is somewhat dim, and I think we must be prepared for large expenditures for matériel, ordnance, and other implements and weapons of war during the period which lies ahead.

Also, as the Senator from Wyoming has said, the costs of military supplies and equipment may increase as much as \$5,000,000,000. As anyone's judgment on this important question is likely to be a guess, my own opinion is that we shall be doing very well if actual military expenditures do not amount to \$45,000,000,000 during the coming year. Indeed, they may exceed that amount.

Mr. President, one is awed by the magnitude of the figures, and one is almost

frightened in dealing with them, because no one wishes to diminish the military effectiveness of the Nation. One is always afraid, if he makes a proposal, that it will affect military efficiency. I have noticed that if anyone seeks to economize, the Defense Department is quick to say it will impair the Nation's military efficiency.

We do not wish to cripple the effectiveness of the Nation. Therefore our friends in the National Defense Establishment have us at a disadvantage. Because of their advantage on technical military knowledge, they make us reluctant to criticize their budget. We are always afraid that it may impair our national defense or that we may be accused of trying to impair it. We are always afraid that if we vote for a reduction in a given expenditure, not only will our friends in the Defense Department criticize us, but our opponents in our States and congressional districts' back home will say, "When you voted to cut the appropriation, you voted to weaken the preparedness program of the United States of America."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. My purpose in rising, I will say to the Senator, was to suggest that the testimony from the lips of Deputy Secretary Lovett ought to be read by every Member of the Senate. I am sure that after reading it, Senators will agree that the purpose, at least of the Deputy Secretary, was to hold expenditures down to a minimum. Let me illustrate it by what he told the committee, that the sum total of all the requests which were presented to him and to the comptroller when they were undertaking to prepare the budget amounted to approximately \$104,000,000,000, and that they were cut down to \$60,650,000,000 when they were presented to the Bureau of the Budget. I desire to make clear the complete confidence I have in Deputy Secretary Lovett and his assistants, and in the comptroller, and in all those who have been working day and night to organize the budget for the defense of our country.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Wyoming, and I wish to say that I share his sentiments. I think Secretary Lovett is a fine public servant. I have similarly characterized the Secretary of Defense, General Marshall, on numerous occasions, and I think Mr. McNeil is a competent comptroller. I am sure the officials in the Department of Defense have done their best, although I am sure that even they with the best of intentions, cannot know where all the waste exists throughout a \$61,000,000,000 budget. I certainly do not want any remarks which I may make to be regarded as a criticism either of their patriotism or of their character. Let the RECORD be perfectly clear on that.

But, at the same time, as Senators we have a responsibility ourselves. An appropriation of \$61,000,000,000, one-fifth of the national income, should be carefully scrutinized by Senators before they vote, even though it might expose them

to charges, which they know to be false, but which may nevertheless be made.

So it is in a spirit of awe and fright that I rise to make a few remarks this afternoon. I also make them in a spirit of great humility. The committee has wrestled with this matter for weeks. The Defense Department has spent months in working with the Bureau of the Budget, and I know that those men worked long hours. We realize that we must be very humble when we rise to discuss this question.

CONGRESS SHOULD SCRUTINIZE ALL EXPENDITURES

But, unless we are to give up a representative democracy, it is the function of the Congress to scrutinize these expenditures. When we cease to scrutinize the expenditures, when we appropriate implicitly every dollar that is asked of us, then we shall have passed from being a representative democracy into being a militarized nation in which the General Staff makes the decision, and the popularly elected representatives of the people merely follow suit. I hope we have not reached that point now. I hope we will never reach it. So it is with these mingled emotions that I rise to discuss this budget.

Mr. President, without criticizing anybody I do think that there are certain portions of the budget which deserve some examination. But before I venture upon a discussion of the individual items I should like to mention two weaknesses of the armed services which are crystal clear to anyone who has ever served with combat troops, and which I think are known also to those who have not served with combat troops.

FIRST WEAKNESS: TENDENCY TO INFLATE OVER-HEAD PERSONNEL

The first is the tendency of the Armed Forces to have a disproportionate share of their manpower locked up in the administrative and the supply services. We have had much testimony about the so-called divisional slice, and it has been testified, I believe, by General Marshall himself, that in order to put combat troops, or troops within combat units equal to 23,000 in number, it is necessary to have 100,000 men in the Army. In other words, in order to get 23,000 men in a combat division, and allied units, the Army has to have 100,000 men. Or to put it in another way, with 100,000 men in uniform there are only 23,000 in combat units.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. Did I understand the Senator to say he was quoting General Marshall?

Mr. DOUGLAS. It was my understanding that the statement came from General Marshall.

Mr. STENNIS. I am very much interested in those facts, Mr. President. I would not question the Senator's statement at all. But, can he be more specific? I think those figures have an important bearing on the subject.

Mr. DOUGLAS. When the testimony on the Marine Corps bill was developed in April of this year, the statement was quoted, and was never challenged, that,

roughly, the Army had to have a total of 100,000 men in order to put 23,000 in combat units.

I desire to point out another qualification, namely, that in a division, equal to 18,800 men they are all treated as being entirely combat, whereas we know that inside the division the headquarters unit, the supply unit, the motor transport unit, the ordnance unit, comprise a very large proportion of the total number. One of the great problems which I think the Army has not solved is the problem of getting maximum fire power out of every 100,000 men.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am delighted to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I rose to make the same remarks relative to the Senator's statement as did the Senator from Mississippi. It was my understanding, and I tried to take it up very quickly, that for every 20,000 men in a division there were something over 60,000 other men—not 100,000. That was the so-called division slice.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The division is composed of 18,800 men as I remember. My figure was that for every 23,000 combat men there have to be roughly 77,000 more. My figure was for a reinforced division stiffened up with artillery and with other specialized units.

That is a great weakness. I do not think the Army has solved it yet, although I understand that Mrs. Rosenberg, Assistant Secretary of Defense in charge of manpower policies, is trying to improve this situation. I am not one who says that every man in an infantry division should be carrying a rifle or a machine gun, or that every man in artillery units should man the guns. Supporting units are needed. But if there is one thing which dispirits the combat soldier it is the fact that while he is on the front line in a rifle company bearing the brunt of the casualties there are thousands and tens of thousands safe back in the supply units in the rear. There is nothing which not only hurts the effectiveness but also the morale of the Armed Forces so much as the enormous preponderance of supply and administrative troops.

EXPERIENCE SHOWS THE NEED FOR IMPROVEMENT

Mr. President, we in the Marine Corps prided ourselves on having a small ratio of administrative and supply men as compared with combat men. I shall never forget, however, the Battle of Peleliu, if I may be permitted to speak of that, where we suffered something like 6,500 casualties. The burden of those casualties fell almost entirely on the infantry regiments and the rifle companies, so that finally many of these combat units were down to a strength of 20 or 25 men per company. As the same time there were 10,000 men and more in the supply and administrative units in the rear.

At the end of that battle the fighting was being done by a relatively small number of men, while there were enormous numbers of men in the rear, relatively safe and comparatively unexposed

to danger, so that the effectiveness of our force was much reduced. In other words, the proportionate effectiveness of a division diminishes as the battle progresses, as the casualties in the combat units mount while the supporting forces in the rear remain relatively intact.

Mr. STENNIS. Are those men in the same division?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes, in the same division. That is merely on the division level. When we come to the corps level and the Army level then we have still further overexpansion. I would say that the Army, and to some degree the military leaders of all our Armed Forces have proceeded on the assumption that there is an unlimited supply of manpower and that there is no need, or little need, for economizing in the use of manpower in the administrative and supply units. I feel that to the men who inside the Army do the fighting they owe an obligation to reduce the waste in supply troops and in overhead troops.

I have given some thought to the formulation of an amendment which may be somewhat inflexible, but which could have substantial morale value, namely, that in combat zones and in theaters of operation, supply, and administrative troops shall not exceed in number, or perhaps shall not exceed a given proportion, of those who are in actual combat units.

A second weakness of the military is in connection with the so-called services of supply.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, before the Senator leaves the point he has been discussing, will he yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes, I am glad to yield.

Mr. STENNIS. Will the Senator explain what he means by the supply units? Does that include men who are definitely in supply, or is it shock troops that can be sent in?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No, it includes engaged men in the supply services. I would say combat troops are quite obviously troops in infantry regiments; or artillery regiments, which although they often do not suffer many casualties themselves, are necessary in the support of infantry troops, tank units, scout companies, and so forth. But I regard as service groups headquarters battalion, supply units, ordnance companies, motor transport, and the like. There can be variations in classification and nomenclature in all these matters. But the point is I do not think that our military leaders have sufficiently appreciated the importance of reducing the ratio of overhead troops to combat troops.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Is it not true that the men to whom the Senator from Illinois is referring have had the same basic combat training the other men have had, and may be used for combat purposes in time of emergency?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is generally true, but the point is they usually become so specialized after a period of time

that it is hard to put them into the combat units.

I hope the Senator will forgive me if I refer to the Marine Corps again. We prided ourselves in the Marine Corps in having everyone a so-called Marine. Everyone was given basic training. Everyone presumably knew how to use a rifle. But some had had their basic training months or in some cases years previous to their battle experience, they usually had lost a great deal of their original skill as riflemen, as well as their physical conditioning. So the commanding generals were reluctant to put them into the combat units because they thought they were not fully prepared to take care of themselves in battle.

At Peleliu, for instance, if the Senator will forgive a further reference to my own experience, I tried to form a battalion out of the headquarters troops in order to bring reinforcements up to the front, and that was the objection, namely, that the supply troops were not prepared for combat, and it may have been a valid objection that was offered at the time. If this is true of the Marine Corps, how much more true would it be of the Army?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. But there are many instances on record of such men having been put into the fight, and having saved the day.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly. That was true at the Battle of the Bulge. My point is that the use of supply troops in combat tends to be a last desperate resort, and that the administrative units are swollen before that.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I was a little perplexed when the Senator said something about an amendment. How would the Senator go about limiting, with any degree of accuracy, the comparative number of troops in combat and noncombat service at any given time?

Mr. DOUGLAS. It would be difficult, but I think it might serve as a reminder to the generals of our Armed Forces that the Congress wants them to get the maximum amount of fire power from a given number of men.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I think the Senator's objective is a very worthy one.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should point out that this limitation would only apply in combat zones and theaters of operation.

TENDENCY OF GENERALS TO INFLATE THEIR PERSONAL STAFFS

The Senator from Maryland led me into a somewhat incautious observation. There is a tendency on the part of nearly all commanding generals to inflate their personal staffs. They like to have large numbers of officers and men—and civilian employees—around them. They regard staff work as extremely important.

Also if a man fails in a combat unit as an officer he tends to be transferred to the staff, so that he can then give orders to the officers and men in the staff units. Everyone who has served with combat troops knows about this inflation of the staff and of the supply units. There is a great and crying need for attention to this problem.

SECOND WEAKNESS: THE SUPPLY AND PROCUREMENT FORCES

The second great trouble which develops is in connection with supply. I want to be very careful in what I say here. I am sure that the officers in the service of supply want to do a good job. I am sure that in their hearts they are patriotic. But they are exposed to great temptations, to which the men in the combat units are not exposed. The men in the combat units have the problem of bravery and skill in battle. The men in the supply units have the problem of working hard, of not wasting material, and of getting 100 cents' worth of value out of every dollar. They also have a different set of temptations unknown to the combat soldier, and they develop a different set of weaknesses, of which the military services are not always fully cognizant; or, if cognizant, they do not fully move to meet them.

Everyone is aware of the difference between the level of personal living at headquarters units and in supply units in the field, as compared with the living conditions of combat companies at the front. One of the most distressing things is that at the very time men are dying in the rifle companies at the front, the supplies are being used up in the supply units in the rear by the men around headquarters or by the men who have access to the supplies. That is one of the most shocking disparities which everyone knows about, but about which little is done, nevertheless. It is one of the worst enemies to morale, because the men at the front who are bearing the burdens, taking the losses, and being killed and wounded know that just a few miles behind them the quartermasters, the adjutants, and the others are living high. The farther back we go, the worse the situation becomes. That disparity is tremendously detrimental to morale.

THE PROBLEM OF THE PROCUREMENT OFFICERS

Then we have the problem of the procurement officers who place the contracts in this country, thousands of miles away from danger. A large proportion of those men are very fine gentlemen. However, we would be less than frank if we were not also aware that some have failed in their obligations to the service and to the country. In saying this I am in no way washing dirty linen in public.

It so happened that I was at the naval hospital at Bethesda throughout the latter part of 1945 and 1946, at the time when the Garsson case burst upon the headlines. I shall never forget our men in the hospital seeing photographs of a general of the United States Army dancing at a wedding reception at the Hotel Pierre in New York at the very time when the battle of the Bulge was being fought, and when we were losing thousands of men from wounds and frostbite. This man, who had apparently been very close to the Garssons, went to New York at their expense. I have before me photographs showing him dancing at the reception. That same gentleman later emerged in the so-called 5-percenter investigation in 1949. He was never court

martialed or disciplined; on the contrary he was allowed to resign, and I consider that rather mild treatment.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. It was rather mild treatment, especially in view of the fact that the situation had to be brought to the attention of the public by a congressional committee, rather than by the military themselves.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct. I believe the Senator from Michigan played a considerable part in that investigation.

Mr. FERGUSON. I recall the photograph to which the Senator refers. I think it is always sad when such matters are not disclosed by the military themselves, and when the military do not immediately discharge the culprits.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Then we were all shocked by what happened when a high procurement officer of the Air Force was brought before a Senate committee. It was found that he had indulged in highly unethical practices, for which he later served a term in prison. I believe the Senator from Michigan was instrumental in pushing that investigation as well.

Mr. FERGUSON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Again it was a senatorial committee which had to go into the matter. It was not done by the Armed Forces themselves.

THE 5-PERCENT INVESTIGATION

Last year the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY] conducted a very able investigation into the activities of five percenters. One of the generals whom I have previously mentioned showed up again. Moreover, a man who was then the Chief of the Supply Division of the Quartermaster Corps was found to have been a close friend of James V. Hunt, one of the alleged five percenters. This general gave confidential information about the purchase program for supplies and equipment for the Army. That confidential information was given to Mr. Hunt before it was made available to the general public. In sending this information to Mr. Hunt, the general said he considered it advisable that the information should be considered "between us—confidential."

This same general was also involved in certain other activities, such as helping a chemical company to get a contract with the Army canceled. This general was suspended at the beginning of the five-percenter investigation. At the end of the investigation he was publicly reprimanded for what the Secretary of the Army merely called errors of judgment, but he continues to serve as Quartermaster General, head of the entire Quartermaster Corps.

In recent months we have had an investigation by a House committee, which disclosed abuses in the Detroit branch of the Ordnance Division and certain improprieties on the part of its commanding officer. The facts were brought out by the House committee under the

very able leadership of Representative PORTER HARDY, whom I have only once or twice met, but who I believe is an outstanding public servant.

These facts were not brought out by the Armed Forces. They were brought out by a House committee. It is interesting to note that the reaction of the Armed Forces was that this commanding officer should be transferred to Heidelberg, Germany. I had never thought that transfer to Heidelberg would be a particularly unpleasant assignment, or would be considered as much of a disciplinary measure. It is a beautiful town above the Rhine. He was to be transferred to a position of equal responsibility.

This particular general made an extraordinary defense. As I remember, subject to correction, he stated that he had done only what all others did in accepting entertainment from contractors.

It was the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] who protested the assignment of this general to Heidelberg, and demanded a greater degree of punishment. According to newspaper accounts, the Army then considered sending him to Japan, but he has finally been assigned to the Aberdeen Proving Ground. But the point I want to make is that again it took a congressional investigation to bring out the facts and that even after a congressional investigation the Army was very slow to discipline its erring general—very, very slow in disciplining him.

THE TOLEDO SITUATION

A short time ago the Hardy committee evidently found things wrong in Toledo, and the Army asked for permission to make an investigation first before the congressional committee published its results. I do not know what has happened in the Toledo case. I believe the case is still under investigation, but I would suggest that Representative HARDY watch that very carefully.

Mr. President, I do not think we should let the impression get abroad that enlisted men who do wrong are court-martialed and sent to prison for long prison terms, that cadets who cheat on their examinations are dismissed, but that generals who err are slapped lightly on the wrist and reprimanded, and frequently advanced.

It is no attack upon the military forces of our country to say that such action destroys morale more effectively than almost any other activity, and, with all deference to the military authorities and with all respect to the services and the supply system, they have not been sufficiently vigilant nor have they been sufficiently firm in trying to discipline their leaders in these matters and in trying to assure a higher standard of behavior.

If I may state it in its baldest terms, that is not the way to get 100 cents worth of value for every dollar. That sort of practice leads to waste—waste of men and waste material—and it tends to break down the morale of the fighting forces themselves.

Mr. President, I know that we should not condemn a barrel because of a few rotten apples in it. However, the way to

prevent the apples in a barrel from contracting rot is to remove the apples which have shown rot, so that the contamination will not spread.

WASTE IS INDICATED

My point is that a sufficient number of cases have developed to permit Members of the Senate at least to wonder whether some of the military costs may not be padded. I certainly do not believe or assert that they are padded intentionally by those on top, because we cannot get more honorable men than General Marshall and Mr. Lovett, but the figures are built up from estimates coming from below, from levels which it is impossible for Messrs. Lovett and Marshall to scrutinize enough to eliminate all waste. We in the Congress, therefore, should be certain that there is a complete scrutiny made of all the items.

Mr. President, more than dollars are involved in this question. The morale of the armed services themselves is involved.

I do not wish to speak at length, but I should like to mention a few soft spots, which at least I have detected in the military system and with respect to which I believe economies could be made.

FLIGHT PAY

First I should like to deal with the question of flight pay for flying personnel, particularly for officers assigned to ground duty. The system of extra pay for the flying forces developed, because of the high risk involved in the early days, in order to compensate for the extra hazard which the flyers incurred. It was probably necessary in the early stages of aviation development.

Bonus pay for duty involving flight was originally conceived to attract well-educated young men to build the Army and Navy Air Corps, during the 1920's, when military service was not a popular vocation and aircraft were extra-hazardous contraptions.

Today the Air Force and Navy have no difficulty in attracting the type of young men they want in numbers. Each service has a month-long waiting list of applicants. All young men must now take their turn of service in the Armed Forces; and flying is much more attractive than the infantry and the deep blue sea.

Noncombatant air flight has become relatively nonhazardous. Vastly improved planes, radio and navigational aids, and so forth, have reduced military air casualties to a relatively small number—424 in 1949—Air Force; 216 during the first 4 months of 1950—Air Force.

Combat flying is extra-hazardous; a case can be made on the hazards involved in the conditions under which operational, training, and test flights are made. However, administrative, maintenance, and proficiency flying are not much more dangerous than commercial flying and do not justify the flight-pay bonus. Flight pay is especially unjustified in the cases of those who are not primarily assigned to flight duties, but who pick up a few hours flight time per month to qualify for the extra \$100 to \$210 allowance.

Toward the end of the war, the poor privates in the rifle companies had a higher percentage of casualties than flying personnel. Yet, there was no comparable increase in the pay of the privates.

Lately, a great weakness has developed in flight pay, in that it has been allowed to cover not only personnel actually assigned to flying, but also to personnel assigned to desk duty. All that is necessary to qualify for flight pay is to get in 4 hours flying time a month.

Far from increasing the effectiveness of the group or wing to which these desk pilots were attached, it actually diminished the effectiveness. Expensive airplanes and high-octane gasoline were used for phony missions and joy riding, in order that they could get their small number of hours in the air, and thus get the higher pay. The Government used up enormous amounts of gasoline and exposed the planes to extra hazards in giving incentive to these fellows to fly, not only on joy rides but on pay rides. Anyone who served near an aviation unit knows that to be a fact.

In many cases, it would be cheaper to give the flight pay without the necessity of putting in the flying time. For instance, one committee report during the Eighty-first Congress, pointed out that it cost the Government at that time about \$200,000,000 in airplane and fuel expense to enable personnel to earn an extra \$75,000,000 in flight pay.

RESTRICTION ON FLIGHT PAY COULD SAVE AS MUCH AS \$100,000,000

I shall offer an amendment which will make me still more unpopular with the Air Force, which will apply tighter restrictions to the application of flight pay. From estimates which I have made, the amendment will save between \$50,000,000 and \$100,000,000. The total in the budget for flight pay for the Air Force alone is \$125,000,000. About one-fifth of it is for proficiency flying of desk pilots, 4 hours a month. That is a gravy train if there ever was one. That amounts to \$25,000,000. With further restriction applying not only to the Air Force, but to the Navy as well, I believe we can save up to \$100,000,000—perhaps more when the savings in gasoline and aircraft are considered.

I should like to emphasize that such an amendment would not prohibit proficiency flying, even though I have never been convinced of its value. When a pilot, who has been assigned to a desk job, returns to flying, a short refresher course should be adequate. Furthermore, many of these pilots can never fly in combat anyway, because of age restrictions. Another point which I should mention is that plane types change rapidly, and proficiency flying in an old plane is worthless in flying a new type. What good is proficiency flying in a propeller-driven plane for flying a jet-propelled plane. But I still would not prohibit proficiency flying, although I shall try to stop bonus pay for it.

Some of the sea pay of naval officers is a somewhat dubious distinction. Naval officers who are quartered ashore go out on a boat one night or two nights a month, and thus can claim they are at

sea. I believe we have had naval officers who have cruised the combat waters of the Potomac and thus have been regarded as being on sea duty. I do not want to mention names, because I do not believe in going after individuals. A real abuse exists, and the armed services thus far have not seen fit to correct it.

TRAVEL ALLOWANCES IN ZONES OF EXPENSES ACTUALLY INCURRED

Let me turn to another point. I refer to travel pay. Because of my white hair I was assigned as adjutant to my division in the Pacific during its noncombat period. I wrote travel orders which moved men around the Pacific, from one station to another. There is a provision to the effect that a man on travel duty receives an expense allowance of \$6 a day. It was impossible for a man to spend more than 35 cents a day, because there were no hotels. We were operating in an area where there were only Government installations. When a man came to a station his fellows would take him in as a matter of course.

I do not wish to pin roses on myself, but I refused to issue travel orders for \$6 a day, because the expenses were not incurred. But I know that all through the Pacific \$6 a day was being granted. I made a hasty estimate one day, and it seemed to me that there must have been millions of dollars of gravy in the form of travel allowances for expenses which were never incurred. I may be giving away professional secrets in this regard, but these practices should be considered, and the taxpayer should not be forced to pay for such excessive travel pay.

I shall submit an amendment to restrict travel allowance payments to the actual amount of expense incurred in travel, so that if there are no expenses incurred no reimbursement can be made. I believe that since we increased travel allowance for civilian employees from \$6 to \$9 a day probably we should increase the military travel allowance to \$9 a day.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator will recall that we had a colloquy a short time ago with respect to a division slice.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would like to say to the Senator from Illinois that since we engaged in that colloquy I have checked with the Department of Defense—and I can give to the Senator the names of the persons with whom I talked about the matter—and I have received some figures. Based on July 1931 figures, and based strictly on the 18 divisions of the Army, a division slice is 86,000. In addition to the 18 divisions the Army has other combat units, such as regimental combat teams, separate battalions, special artillery groups, and antiaircraft artillery battalions. These separate units are the equivalent of 6 divisions in combat strength. So that if we add the 6 divisions to the 18 divisions we have a total of 24 divisions. On that basis the combat slice is 64,260.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Two and two-thirds times the number in the combat units,

with less than 100,000 men, is roughly 37,000. The figures have changed very much from the ones General Marshall gave earlier in the year.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The figures stated by me are as of July 31 of this year.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it assumed that the divisions are at full strength, or are the figures based on the actual number of men in the divisions?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I believe the figures are based on divisions at full strength.

Mr. DOUGLAS. To the degree to which the divisions are at less than full strength, the ratio of combat men to the total number would be diminished.

So, Mr. President, as I have said, we could save millions of dollars on the item of travel allowances.

ONE BILLION FIVE HUNDRED MILLION DOLLARS FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The budgets provide approximately \$1,500,000,000 for research and development purposes. Mr. President, "research" is a blessed word nowadays. All one has to do in order to get large amounts of money appropriated is to say that the money is intended for research.

In that connection let me say that all of us remember the old lady who said she loved the blessed word "Mesopotamia"; she did not know what it meant, but it sounded fine, and it always had a mesmeric influence over her. Thus, Mr. President, the word "research" has a mesmeric influence over the Bureau of the Budget and the Congress of the United States.

Of course, Mr. President, research has resulted in some wonderful things; it has produced the atomic bomb, the so-called proximity fuze, radar, and a whole series of other important things. However, I happen to have spent a great deal of research money in my day, and I know that today much of the money appropriated for research can be wasted. Many projects upon which large amounts of money are spent seem extremely unnecessary.

I believe that the titles to numerous of the projects are classified. I do not wish to indulge in ridicule by bringing a long list of them out into the open by reading them here on the floor; but certainly the titles or some of them are strange and wonderful to look at, particularly those in the field of psychological warfare and group morale. If we probe deeply into the research budget, I think we shall find that a lot of this money is going down the drain. So I urge all of us to sprinkle a little salt on the appropriations for research, for which we are spending \$1,500,000,000.

LESS ESSENTIAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS CAN WAIT

Suppose we cut that item 5 percent, which amounts to roughly \$75,000,000. Would that mean we would lose 5 percent of the effectiveness of the research? I do not believe so. Those in charge of the program would abandon, I hope, the most foolish of the projects and with close scrutiny they should, I believe, be able to consolidate some of the similar research projects being undertaken by each of the services; and personally I do not believe

the research program would suffer very much; perhaps it would not suffer at all. In other words, to diminish by 5 percent the expenditures for research would not reduce the effectiveness of the research program by a proportionate amount.

Let me give an example, during World War II one of the large aircraft companies, having more research and development money than necessary for its engineering division, decided to make complete ink tracings on expensive tracing cloth of all the drawing of an obsolete airplane. This project consumed thousands of man-hours, money, and materials. It was completely unnecessary; some adequate records were available in blueprints. If we reduce the amount of money available for research and development, this is the type of work which would go by the boards; not such items as top research on atomic energy or guided missiles.

Then I have before me a written description of a project, and I wonder whether it is to be regarded as classified. The item is marked "restricted." That is the lowest form of classification. Let me ask the Senator from Wyoming whether I would be breaching the security regulations of the Government if I read into the Record a description of a project entitled "basic inductee barometer."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois is a very good judge of what he may put into the Record and what he will keep out of the Record.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me show this to the Senator from Wyoming. I do not wish to be responsible for a breach of security. This item is called "basic inductee barometer."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois has handed me a document which apparently has been handed to him by someone in the Department of Defense. On the document is printed the word "restricted."

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is the lowest classification.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes, it is the lowest classification.

The Senator cannot put upon me the responsibility for his divulging that which was handed to him under a classification of "restricted."

Before the Senator came on the floor, I said that for my part I would not indulge in a description of any operation by the Department of Defense which was classified, so long as I know that representatives of Tass are here in Washington and are able to put 2 and 2 together.

The Senator from Illinois must be his own judge of what he releases from the umbrella of restrictions.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I turn to the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], who is a member of the Armed Services Committee; and I offer him this description of a research project, and ask him whether he thinks I would be violating security if I were to read this description.

Mr. STENNIS. In other words, Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois turns from a member of the Appropriations Committee which handles this ap-

propriation to a member of the Armed Services Committee. In effect, the Senator is now appealing to a lower court. However, he is supposed to go to a higher court, if he is not satisfied by the Senator from Wyoming. [Laughter.]

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it true that the weather report is classified "restricted" by the military services?

It will be noted, Mr. President, that if we say that everything that has a "restricted" stamp put upon it can never be divulged, then the military department will be like the doctors, who can always bury their mistakes. [Laughter.]

Let me call upon the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], who served with great distinction in the Navy during the war, to look at the description of this project and see whether I would be betraying any secrets if I were to read aloud this description.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. HENNINGS. Does my able friend, the Senator from Illinois have any knowledge as to who determines when the stamp "restricted" shall be placed upon certain documents and when it shall not be placed upon certain documents?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No, I do not.

Mr. HENNINGS. I take it that the Senator from Illinois is aware that certain high-ranking officers of the armed services—to my knowledge, in the past made it a practice—and I hope this no longer is true—to have certain nondescript and routine papers stamped "secret" for their own private purposes? There were occasions when officers who wanted to take a trip across the country in a drawing room at public expense—induced the cooperation of the ensign on the night watch or the sergeant on duty at the headquarters or department to stamp, for example, the day's roster in the department from where the officer happened to be working with those papers in his brief case.

The top brass traveled to the Pacific coast, to visit this daughter and son-in-law, while he enjoyed a month's vacation in sunny California on a per diem expense account basis. Those papers were marked "top secret," in order to enable him to have a drawing room. Had the papers been simply marked "secret" he would have had to obtain leave and travel on his own time, at his own expense, and rough it in a lower berth. [Laughter.] This abuse was a notorious practice at one time and applies to the freedom with which the "secret" rubber stamp is used.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is the Senator from Missouri giving me a lawyer's opinion to the effect that the security of the United States would not be endangered in the slightest if I read aloud the description of this research project?

Mr. HENNINGS. While I must disclaim any pretensions to expertness in classification of service papers, I can say to the distinguished Senator from Illinois that I can see in nowise how the reading of that matter just handed to me by the distinguished Senator would,

in anywise endanger the security or safety or in any degree impair the defenses of the United States.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In view of that assurance—although with some trepidation, but on the whole feeling that the balance is in favor of not violating our security—I should like to read the description of the research project in regard to "basic inductee barometer."

Now that we have received assurance in connection with these other matters, I should like to read the description which I have before me, which is headed "Basic inductee barometer":

Under mobilization conditions, quantities of men are inducted into naval service who do not voluntarily choose such service as their way of life. Their acceptance of their new status as members of the Navy varies through wide ranges. The active, volunteer reservist, at one end, has demonstrated his readiness to serve if needed. At the other extreme, there may be numbers who as actively reject or oppose their role as Navy inductees. In between will be all shades and degrees of acceptance. This project will provide for the development of a continuous base-line measure of inductee reaction upon entrance into naval service. It is planned to start administration of the device with the advent of mass or partial mobilization, through recruit training commands and receiving stations and to continue its administration at regular intervals. The range of content will include personal reactions derived from the readjustment in changing from civilian to military status, attitudes toward the American role in the war, and the degree of faith and confidence in naval equipment, leadership, and operations. Of special importance will be the analysis of the effects of enemy propaganda, and the possible effects of temporary national reverses, or of a conditioned prolonged, and perhaps inconclusive hostilities or mobilization short of war.

Mr. President, it was H. L. Mencken, I think, who once described the writings of Thorstein Veblen as being "pots of pish-posh." I sometimes think that this somewhat classic description could be applied to some of the project description I have read. There are others, but for reasons of brevity, I shall not give them.

NEARLY \$3,000,000,000 FOR EXPEDITING PRODUCTION

Mr. President, if we go through the budget we shall find some interesting items under what is termed "expediting production." They total approximately \$2,942,000,000, \$1,100,000,000 for the Army, \$732,000,000 for the Navy, \$1,109,000,000 for the Air Force. What are these items? They are to be used to buy tools and equipment and machinery, to which the Government will hold title, but which will be used by the contractors in producing articles for the military. It is also to be used to build or to rehabilitate Government-owned plants, primarily for the production of highly classified items.

I desire to emphasize that these appropriations of nearly \$3,000,000,000 are over and above any help which the contractor might get through (a) accelerated amortization, (b) a guaranteed V-loan, through section 301 of the Defense Production Act, or (c) a direct loan from the RFC.

I should like to point out that in many cases these companies are to get at least two of these advantages, accelerated amortization of investments for plant construction, plus the buying of the tools and equipment by the Government.

An analysis of the figures for the Air Force alone shows that the estimate of obligations for facilities and equipment under the term "expediting production" for the fiscal years 1951 and 1952 amount to \$1,889,000,000. But the firms receiving this equipment from the Air Force for the production of Air Force items were also receiving, \$495,000,000 worth of certificates of necessity for accelerated amortization and loan guarantees amounting to \$187,796,000, plus some small direct loans.

I have here a list of 11 large companies, receiving large amounts of tax amortization privileges, and for whom the Government is to spend large amounts for machinery and equipment. This list shows both the planned expenditures for machinery and equipment and the amount of accelerated amortization which is to be given.

I do not believe in itemizing individual names, because it exposes an individual company to criticism which at times is unjust, and holds it up to suspicion, when in some cases suspicion is not justified. So, just as last Friday I did not give the names of the magazines which were getting enormous gross revenues from advertising, I shall not give the names of these industrial concerns.

DUPLICATION OF TAX CERTIFICATES AND GOVERNMENT-FURNISHED FACILITIES

But I cite the case of one large company for whom the Government is to buy equipment valued at \$215,980,000, which has already obtained \$126,741,000 in accelerated amortization. I shall cite also the case of another company, for which the Government is to buy equipment valued at \$146,450,000, for which \$76,079,000 in accelerated amortization has already been granted. Another company, which is to get \$50,000,000 for equipment, has been granted \$22,000,000 of accelerated amortization. Another company, which is getting \$59,000,000 of equipment, has been granted \$5,374,000 of accelerated amortization. Another company, which is getting \$6,000,000 in equipment, has had granted to it \$5,478,000 of accelerated amortization. Another company, which is getting \$17,070,000 worth of equipment, has had granted to it \$6,303,000 of accelerated amortization. One company which is getting equipment valued at \$2,470,000, has had a certificate of necessity of \$4,201,000, and has had a loan of \$25,000,000 guaranteed. I wish to emphasize that these are for the Air Force only.

Now, Mr. President, at the time the Defense Production Act was under consideration, when the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] proposed that the Government should build plants, he stirred up a storm upon the floor. That was said to be socialism, and he was quite bitterly taken to task for proposing that the Government could build plants. Yet, here is a proposal to have the Government appropriate \$3,000,000,000 for purchasing equipment and putting up

plants, in addition to all the certificates of necessity for accelerated amortization, guaranteed loans, and direct loans.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield to the senior Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. I merely desire to comment on the Senator's reminder of what the proposal was, when it was made by my colleague the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], to say that I do not believe the proposal he made at that time was socialistic, in any sense of the word. As the Senator knows, during World War II, the Government built plants. Unfortunately, they sold some of them at a price of 20 cents on the dollar, to some of the people who would cry socialism today if the experiment were repeated, because they feel they would not be able to get them for 20 cents on the dollar, since, "once bitten, twice shy," the Government would not permit it again. I have in mind the United States Steel's acquisition at Provo, Utah, of those great steel mills, at approximately 25 cents on the dollar, and I call the Senator's attention to the fact that they are getting ready to take \$40,000,000 more, if they can get it, to deepen the Trinity River, so that they can ship their products out at the taxpayers' expense.

When the President of the United States, in 1948, pointed out that we had to have an increase in steel capacity, and that, unless the steel industry got busy, the Government would have to take a hand in it, they cried "socialism" and "communism." Now they are proceeding by the use of amortization certificates, by which they are going to amortize their cost.

Mr. DOUGLAS. To date, certificates of necessity for investments totaling \$9,300,000,000 have been issued.

Mr. McMAHON. But that is not socialism at all.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But this is a proposal for \$3,000,000,000 worth of Government purchases of equipment and machinery, which is then to be given to the companies for them to use, although the Government will retain title to them. The point is that after the war a very considerable portion of that equipment will have peacetime industrial uses, just as after the last war. That is particularly true, if I may use an example, in the case of heavy presses for aircraft manufacturers. They can work in the production of peacetime planes as well as for war planes.

EXPERIENCE OF WORLD WAR II

After the last war, as the Senator from Connecticut has reminded us, the equipment was sold and plants were sold to private companies for a song—for very, very small amounts. The Government took a beating to the extent of billions and billions of dollars. It spent, I believe \$7,500,000,000 for the purchase of such equipment. Now we are starting off with \$3,000,000,000 more, and that is merely a beginning.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I believe the Senator from Illinois made one omission. He cited two or three areas in which the business community, during times of mobilization, is able to get special concessions, such as the amortization of plant, equipment, and tools. I think the Senator should also point out that the great plant which needs quick amortization of plant and tools, and receives a Government loan, also gets a contract. Let us make it quite clear that it is not merely a matter of getting help which is necessary for tooling up, but the plant receives a contract. I think the practice is that once a primary contractor receives a contract, he proceeds to get further contracts.

If the Senator will investigate further, I believe he will find that a large number of tools which are purchased, particularly in the machine-tool industry, and a large number of plants which are being considered, are already in existence. As a matter of fact, Representative after Representative and Senator after Senator have made protests because of the failure to use existing plants. The Small Business Committee has been taking testimony with reference to the utilization of small-business facilities. There seems to be an unwillingness properly to utilize the existing plant establishments. Something must be done about it. Somewhere in the appropriation bill I hope an amendment will be inserted to provide for more subcontracting and more prime contracting with small firms, so that we shall not have to build so many additional plants.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator for his contribution to the discussion.

First, I may say that of the amount requested by the Air Force I find that more than \$500,000,000 is to be furnished to three industrial giants, and virtually \$110,000,000 to two other large concerns. In the main, the equipment is going into the hands of industrial giants.

BULK OF PROCUREMENT GOES TO LARGE CONCERNS

The Senator from Minnesota has touched on a point which I should have mentioned earlier, namely, the affinity which procurement officers have for huge industrial concerns. Every one of us knows the feeling of frustration which we have experienced in trying to trace bids down and find out what has happened to them in connection with small business concerns. In some cases, the firms never received any notification that a contract was to be let. Somehow the mail never reaches them, or if it does, it reaches them a day or two before the bids are to be closed, when it is too late for them to prepare their cost estimates; or, if they do bid, and in some cases make low bids, there are many cases in which the specifications are changed, and their bids are thrown out. So the small firm has great difficulty in competing; and there are so many cases that one begins to wonder whether it is all an accident.

I will grant that the Defense Department furnishes numerous shoulders for small-business men to cry on. I suspect that the sole duty of a great many defense employees is to be nice to small-business men, buy them lunches, and

show them the Pentagon as a substitute for a contract.

What applies in the case of small business may apply also in the case of businesses whose bids would be low, but who somehow find they are never "under the mistletoe" when the supply officer is around. The supply officers seem to like to deal with agents of big concerns. They seem to feel an emotional affinity for them.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Is it not a fact that many of these bids are negotiated bids, and that the smaller businesses are not given an opportunity to know anything about them until they are all arranged?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct. I was speaking of standardized articles for which open bids can be taken, but, as the Senator points out, many of the requirements are for relatively unique articles for which there is no market comparison; the contracts are negotiated and, somehow, the small-business man happens to be left out. This is not only favoritism, but it leaves a lot of our production capacity idle while spending tax dollars to build up the capacity of the large concerns and increasing the rate of industrial concentration.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am sure the Senator knows that the chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Appropriations is also interested in wanting the participation of small business.

Mr. DOUGLAS. No Member of the Senate is more interested in the welfare of small business than is the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Wyoming is also opposed to all phases of monopoly.

We went into this question in the committee with respect to small business, with the express purpose of indicating to the Department of Defense that it is the desire of the Congress to see that small business is not sidetracked in the manner described by the Senator.

It so happened that Mr. John D. Small, Chairman of the Munitions Board, submitted to us a nine-point program with respect to the encouragement of small business. The statement of Mr. Small appears in the hearings, beginning on page 10, and I should like to read a paragraph or two into the RECORD at this point so that it will be shown that at least some effort is being made to encourage small business. I read:

I know that the committee will be interested in our latest compilation of prime contract awards to small business. During fiscal year 1950, \$1,310,615,000, or 24.5 percent, of the annual total was awarded to small business. However, during the first 10 months of fiscal year 1951, through April 30, small business has been awarded a total of \$4,300,000,000 or more than three times the amount they received during the entire fiscal year 1950. This represents 22.5 percent of the total awards. However, the per-

centage is increasing, for example, during April, small business received 28.8 percent.

A breakdown of Department awards to small business for the months of January and April of this year indicates a trend which we hope will continue. The Air Force awarded 18 percent of its total procurement in April to small business as against 10.2 percent in January. The Army awarded 40 percent in April as against 22.4 percent in January; and the Navy awarded 16.2 percent in April as compared to 12.5 percent in January.

It is unnecessary for me to continue to read. I shall not trespass upon the time of the Senator from Illinois, but with his permission, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a portion of the testimony of Mr. Small.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SMALL BUSINESS PROGRAM

Specifically, the following 9-point program of policies and procedures of benefit to small business are being followed in the Department of Defense:

(1) In the implementation of the program to broaden the industrial base of suppliers, small-business concerns within the limits of their capabilities, are being given full and serious consideration in the establishment of new sources.

(2) Small-business specialists are being assigned to each major procurement office in order to devote their efforts exclusively toward assisting small-business concerns. Such specialists are charged with the responsibility to review requirements prior to procurement action, to determine which requirements are susceptible of being filled by small business, and to recommend target objectives with reference to the amount of military business which should be awarded to small concerns.

(3) Although there are many major items of procurement that cannot be divided into small lots and produced by small business, for example, airframes, aircraft engines, tanks, et cetera, we have directed that wherever practicable, procurements be divided into reasonably small lots to bring the sizes of requirements within the reach of a greater number of suppliers.

(4) Prospective contractors not familiar with military procedures are given assistance in learning how to do business with the Department of Defense through the media of publications, Government small-business clinics, and the operation of the Central Military Procurement Information Office, and the Munitions Board Office of Small Business.

(5) To publicize military requirements to be purchased by formal advertising, unclassified invitations to bid are listed in the Department of Commerce daily synopsis of bid invitations. To provide information concerning potential subcontract business, unclassified prime contracts over \$25,000 are included in the Department of Commerce weekly synopsis of contract awards. These synopses are distributed nationally through over 6,000 outlets. Instructions have just been promulgated to publicize proposed negotiated procurements in the same manner.

(6) Subcontracting is encouraged, where necessary and required, in dealings with the larger prime contracts.

(7) Small-business concerns are being made acquainted with subcontracting opportunities by means of a series of exhibits featuring the components and assemblies of end items contracted for with prime contractors.

(8) Up-to-date listings of qualified suppliers are maintained in all purchasing offices of the Department of Defense, small concerns

are enabled and encouraged to qualify as bidders for those items which they are capable of manufacturing.

(9) Information with respect to the capacities and skills of small-business concerns is compiled for use not only in current military procurement but also for use in mobilization planning.

PRIME CONTRACTS AWARDED TO SMALL BUSINESS

I know that the committee will be interested in our latest compilation of prime contract awards to small business. During fiscal year 1950, \$1,310,615,000, or 24.5 percent, of the annual total was awarded to small business. However, during the first 10 months of fiscal year 1951, through April 30, small business has been awarded a total of \$4,300,000,000 or more than three times the amount they received during the entire fiscal year 1950. This represents 22.5 percent of the total awards. However, the percentage is increasing; for example, during April small business received 28.8 percent.

A breakdown of Department awards to small business for the months of January and April of this year indicates a trend which we hope will continue. The Air Force awarded 18 percent of its total procurement in April to small business as against 10.2 percent in January. The Army awarded 40 percent in April as against 22.4 percent in January; and the Navy awarded 16.2 percent in April as compared to 12.5 percent in January.

During the period July 1, 1950, to March 31, 1951, small business received 67 percent of the number of contracts awarded by negotiation, which represents 12 percent of the dollar value. This percentage is also increasing in that while during the month of April small business still received approximately the same percentage of contracts awarded, it received 27 percent of the dollar value.

At this point I would like to offer for inclusion in the record a compilation of military purchase actions for the period July 1, 1950, through March 31, 1951, which is attached as the last page of this statement.

Senator O'MAHONEY. It will be inserted in the record at the conclusion of your statement.

Mr. SMALL. Thank you, sir.

As a matter of interest we have made an attempt to analyze the figures contained in this table and to determine first, which items of our requirements small business could actually produce, and, secondly, what proportion of these requirements they are actually producing. It is obvious that small business is not equipped to produce aircraft carriers, airframes, airplane engines, tanks, et cetera, to mention only a few. On this basis, we found that in the Department of the Navy small business actually received 40.6 percent of the total requirements for those items which small business could produce. The Department of the Army purchased 39.1 percent of such items from small business. While the Air Force analysis is not complete, the elimination of aircraft alone from the Air Force procurement program increases its percentage from 11 percent to 26 percent. These figures reflect procurement action during the period July 1, 1950, to March 31, 1951.

As a further indication of small business participation in our procurement program the Air Force reports that its 102 field installations scattered throughout the country have purchased locally \$43,750,000 worth of material during the first 2 months of this calendar year. Of this amount, 70 percent or \$30,453,000 went to small concerns. This 70 percent is an increase from 64 percent for the last quarter of 1950. Only yesterday the Navy Department announced that contracts for the construction of 102 barges, at

a total cost of more than \$2,000,000, had been awarded to eight small business firms.

DEFENSE SUBCONTRACTS

It is relatively easy to prepare statistics covering the award of prime contracts to small business. It is very much more difficult to accumulate information concerning the substantial share of defense procurement that is going to small business through subcontracts. It is certain, however, that the dollar volume of work going to small business through subcontracts is manyfold the volume going to them through direct contracts.

Subcontracting must be recognized as an effective instrument in the distribution of military procurement to these smaller independent enterprises not equipped to undertake prime contracts. Much of our effort has been directed toward aiding those small enterprises having no existing subcontract arrangement with larger producers. Such firms normally engaged in the manufacture of civilian products are now short of the raw materials to continue their line. For example, to aid those seeking subcontracts, the Department of the Air Force recently arranged an exhibit of prime contractors in New York City where prints, drawings, and specifications were available to potential subcontractors. This plan, developed by the Air Force, proved so successful that another exhibit was arranged at Chicago last month, and another show sponsored by all three military departments was held in Boston on May 15. Additional exhibits will be arranged through the cooperative efforts of the Army, Navy, and Air Force at Detroit, Los Angeles, Fort Worth, and other principal cities.

The extent of subcontracting is best demonstrated in a recent study of 863 Air Force prime contracts, totaling approximately \$5,000,000,000. The data collected indicated that approximately 75 percent of the subcontracts were awarded to companies employing less than 500. In compiling this information, Air Materiel Command representatives approached 59 major prime contractors in every field of production. These prime contractors submitted figures which included a total of 32,382 subcontracts. Of this total 24,306 of the subcontractors were in the category of small business who cannot produce engines, airframes, et cetera, but could produce components.

Subcontracting in the aircraft industry is now approaching World War II levels, on the basis of the proportion of the program which is subcontracted. The reason for the high percentage of subcontracting is that the emphasis today is not so much on production as productibility—expanding and production base so that 50,000 planes a year could be built, should it become necessary to do so.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I might add, Mr. President, that Mr. Small, in World War II, was the most efficient and very able and intelligent head of the Civilian Production Administration. He did a great deal during World War II to protect the small businesses of the United States.

I thank the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I will say that the Senator from North Dakota at times is completely at a loss, when talking to his constituents, to explain the enormous appropriations which we are making, similar to the one we are making today. The average man will say, "Senator, when World War II ended we were by far the strongest Nation in the air, on the sea, and on land. After the war ended we had \$106,000,000,000 worth of surplus

property. Yet we are told today that we are very, very weak." The Senator from North Dakota is asked to explain why we are so weak. Very frankly, the Senator from North Dakota has been unable to explain it. I wonder whether the Senator from Illinois can give the Senator from North Dakota some light on that subject.

PREMATURE DISBANDING OF ARMED FORCES NOW PROVING COSTLY

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from North Dakota is very disarming in the way he puts his question. I have certainly no complete explanation for it. I would say that one factor was the premature and excessive disbanding of our Armed Forces. I do not think we should have reduced them as much or as rapidly as we did. That was, however, in response to popular pressure, because the people of the United States demanded that their relatives and friends should be released from the armed services; the pressure upon Congress and upon the administration was overwhelming.

Six years ago at this time everyone was shouting, "Get the men out of the service." That left excess equipment. There is an old saying, "Where the carion lies there the vultures flock to feast." There were rich pickings. There was also the feeling that we should dispose of the surplus equipment, and so there was a rush to do so.

I am not making any charges against the War Assets Administration or any other organization. I dare say they did their job as best they could. But the point is that we scrapped our Armed Forces prematurely; we scrapped our industrial plants prematurely. We are paying for those mistakes now.

Mr. LANGER. Will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. We are now faced with a bill providing for \$61,000,000,000. How much of that does the Senator from Illinois believe is warranted?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Who can say? That has kept me awake for at least a month.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. A month?

Mr. DOUGLAS. A month—at night. I hope I am awake during the day time.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I was wondering if the Senator wanted his friends and colleagues on the floor to understand that he sleeps during the daytime? He is in very fine physical condition for a man who has not slept for a month.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Well, it kept me awake at night. I will modify my remarks.

In answering the question asked by the Senator from North Dakota I will say I do not know. It may be that as much as 10 percent will be wasted, but I would hesitate to cut the bill by 10 percent because I would not know quite where to make a reduction of \$6,000,000,000, and I would be in mortal terror that I might be making a reduction on items which would be essential. I have given some thought to the possibility of asking the Defense Department to reduce the amount by a given amount, and, perhaps, that would not be such a bad idea. But I am sure they would tell us we could not reduce the budget by \$6,000,000,000 with-

out impairing our defense, and the men at the top would believe it, although the men down below who produced some of the padded estimates might possibly be able to effect real economies of that magnitude. I shall be modest. I would like to cut this budget by a billion dollars. I shall submit amendments to cut between \$600,000,000 and \$1,000,000,000. If we can cut it by a billion dollars I shall feel very happy. That will mean a cut of 1 2/3 percent.

I might say that the House has already effected a net reduction of about a billion dollars. The House claims they made a saving of \$1,500,000,000, but \$500,000,000 of that was merely because it was found that the schedule of deliveries on new aircraft would be slower than anticipated, so that the real reduction the House made was about a billion dollars below the budget request. If we could save another billion dollars, I think we would be doing well. In terms of percentages, that is not a large figure, only 1.6 percent. In terms of absolute amount, it is very real. Perhaps debating this in some detail and thereby indicating the readiness of Congress to go into detail may have a deterring effect upon the military authorities who, with all their virtues, do not have a tender solicitude for the public purse. They have many virtues, but solicitude in the matter of expenditures does not seem to be one of them.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from North Dakota. I never know what is coming from the Senator from North Dakota, and that adds to the challenge of his questioning.

Mr. LANGER. I am looking for light, that is all, and I believe I can get it from the distinguished Senator from Illinois, because of the thoroughness with which he has gone into these matters. I am not a member of either of the committees having to deal with the subject. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator whether, in the course of his investigation, he has found that the \$61,000,000,000 is itemized in some way so it can be thoroughly checked to the satisfaction of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have a book full of budget documents here, and in general, it is itemized, but one never knows what lies underneath the items. It is often very difficult to determine what is in these programs if one is not a member of the Appropriations Committee, without access to the justification sheets and breakdowns. It is almost overpowering. It seems as though it were a tank division descending upon one and all one has is a rock with which to stand up against that tank division.

Mr. LANGER. Aside from the members of the committee, the average Senator has to vote blindly upon the proposal.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The situation is very difficult. Here is a document which is itemized, running along for 223 pages. I will offer it to the Senator. Does it not appear almost overpowering?

Mr. LANGER. I wanted to get the idea of the Senator as to whether it is

possible to learn much in the short space of time we have had to look at the bill. The bill was reported on Friday last and no Senator has had time thoroughly to analyze it. In the opinion of the Senator from Illinois, how long a time should the average Senator have, even to make an attempt to analyze such a bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. He really should have a year to do that. He should give at least a year's study to the bill. But we do not have a year. We have to do with the time available to us. The average tendency, as evidence by the very small attendance on the floor this afternoon, is to say "Oh, this is so huge. We cannot cope with it. We will trust the Department of Defense and we will trust our committee, which is a noble committee. I cannot do anything. I will stay in my office and write letters."

But when the Senate as a whole does that, when it accepts everything handed to it by the Defense Department, then democracy in the United States is weakened and we come nearer to being a military state. That is something which we certainly do not want to have happen. We should take note of the fact, Mr. President, that with the enactment of this bill we are turning over one-fifth of our national economy to the military.

Mr. LANGER. That is why I rose to commend the Senator from Illinois for his painstaking efforts. I only wish we had a larger attendance on the floor of the Senate, and that all of us could work this thing out in an endeavor to get rid of any water there may be in the bill. Certainly the Senator from Illinois is doing a very fine job.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from North Dakota.

NEED FOR FURTHER UNIFICATION OF THE ARMED SERVICES

Another source of savings which could be made, and which has not been fully developed by the military service, is in the field of duplicate equipment and duplicate services, still mounting despite the supposed unification of the three services. Let me touch on one factor, which may appear to be minor, but which is symptomatic of very large amounts of waste in the Defense Establishment, namely, the parallel medical supply systems which are maintained by the Department of the Army and by the Department of the Navy. I should like to cite one illustration, for which I am indebted to the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, under the chairmanship of the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN]. A staff memorandum prepared for that committee pointed out that in the city of Oakland, Calif., there was an Army medical depot and a Navy medical depot. The Navy depot utilized only two-thirds of its space. The Army depot utilized only 53 percent of its space. In the Army, with an inventory of \$8,150,000, the operating costs were \$695,000, or a percentage rate of about 8½ percent. The Navy, with an inventory value of \$13,367,000, had operating costs of only \$776,000, or about 5½ percent. Why was it necessary to maintain duplicate services directly across the street from each other? Or, to put it in another way, why was not

the Navy medical supply depot utilized to its full capacity, so that only a portion of the Army supply depot need be utilized?

The staff director of the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments approved a report which stated:

This is a frank admission that waste, extravagance, and duplicate services presently exist in the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

The report went on to say:

Should the committee believe that action is feasible at this time, savings could be effected in the following respects:

1. A substantial reduction in manpower and public funds.
2. Savings could be effected in procurement, and the elimination of excess inventories.
3. Hoarding of material could be reduced.
4. Elimination of one agency competing against another for the same items of supply.
5. Reduction in the cost of crating, packing, and handling of supplies.
6. Freight and transportation costs could be reduced materially.
7. Coordination of warehousing facilities under uniform cataloging could reduce storage space for other purposes.

Mr. President, we are aware of the great administrative problems which the armed services must face. We do not ask that all those problems be settled at the moment, in one month or so. But we do say that there should be greater zeal in trying to effect economies and reduce expenditures, so as not bankrupt the Nation. Because if we bankrupt the Nation the result will be inflation and catastrophe. Not only will the costs of military supplies go up, but the middle class will be swallowed up, and we shall suffer great hardships. The armed services have an obligation not merely to defend the country from enemies from without, but to defend it from inflation from within.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, just a few moments ago the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee which presents the bill read from the record the report of Mr. John Small, who is Chairman of the Munitions Board. He appropriately commended Mr. Small for the excellent work he is doing in relation to the participation of small business in the defense program.

I should like to ask the senior Senator from Illinois if he is willing to permit me to include in the RECORD at this point a Senate report entitled "Concentration of Defense Contracts in Industry—Report of the Select Committee on Small Business, United States Senate." The report was presented to the Senate by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], who is a member of the Small Business Committee. The report is very revealing. I ask unanimous consent that it be incorporated in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the report (No. 551) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Your committee has long suspected that a select few manufacturers have been receiving the lion's share of defense contracts since

Korea. The committee in no way doubts the high competence of these companies to fulfill their defense contracts satisfactorily and is sure that these companies are motivated only by patriotism to speed the completion of our defense program during the present emergency. But the committee questions the economic wisdom of dislocating the entire economy by heaping the load of defense work onto a few giant concerns, many of whom are at the same time operating at close to peak capacity on civilian production. Inevitably such an unbalance leaves a large mass of smaller but equally competent companies cut off from those scarce basic materials essential for civilian production and, at the same time, unable to obtain defense work.

To check these suspicions, the committee staff conducted an independent survey on the concentration of defense contracts in industry. This study reveals a far greater concentration of defense contracts than any Government figures have thus far indicated; 10 large manufacturing companies have been handed 40 percent of the total dollar volume of defense contracts since Korea; 50 companies command almost two-thirds of the dollar volume of defense contracts. This is a considerably higher concentration than during World War II when 10 large manufacturing companies controlled 30 percent of the war contract dollar volume and 100 companies, two-thirds.

Your committee recognizes full well the fact that there is a large "hard core" of major procurements which must be undertaken by the giants of American industry. It is obvious that there are only a few firms able to assemble planes or tanks, which constitute a high percentage of our defense spending at the present time. On the other hand, your committee feels obliged to issue this report, pointing out that the top 50 concerns have received many contracts for which there were alternative sources of supply equally competent to perform the work satisfactorily.

This era of partial mobilization is an exaggeration of the World War II parallel, when between 1940 and 1942, one-fifth of the businesses in the United States were forced to close their doors in spite of a wider spread of war work at that time. Unless all segments of industry can be kept functioning and our defense contracts spread out over a broad industrial base, a sudden call for all-out mobilization might find a substantial part of our industrial strength unavailable to make its important contribution.

The long-range effect of such concentration of defense contracts in industry will be equally as disastrous to our free-enterprise system as the short-range harm to the mobilization effort. Concentration of industrial strength inevitably leads toward monopoly whereby a few producing units grow larger while smaller ones are starved out. As the number of manufacturers decreases, monopolistic practices increase, thereby stifling free competition. To maintain a balanced economy with free competition and an economic climate in which small businesses can flourish, our industrial system cannot be strait-jacketed by utter dependence upon the output of a few score companies.

Since Korea, unfortunately, the trend of concentration has been accelerated with the weight of production resting with fewer and fewer companies. The ranking defense industries have not cut back their civilian production in an amount equal to defense contracts so are almost all operating well above their production schedules at the time of Korea. As the defense buying program increases, these companies are overloaded with work and have increasing backlogs of unfilled defense orders. Civilian automobile production, for instance, during the first half of 1951, almost matches the record first-half 1950 production rate, and according to present estimates, 1951 will be the second highest auto-producing year in history. Such ci-

civilian production records are being equaled in the other hard-goods industries, until now civilian production of big companies is more dependent upon sales than upon the capacity of the production lines. Defense Mobilizer Charles E. Wilson, in his second report to President Truman on Meeting Defense Goals, stated: "We have reached a level of total national production about equal to the peak rate output of World War II." But this peak production is centralized in a few industries, while the majority of small businesses who participated in World War II production, are still waiting in the anterooms of procurement offices for a chance to participate in the current mobilization.

The present pinnacle of concentration of defense contracts is clearly not the intent of Congress as stated in the Defense Production Act of 1950: "It is the sense of the Congress that small-business enterprises be encouraged to make the greatest possible contribution."

Neither is this concentration of defense contracts in keeping with the policies formulated by the Defense Department. Secretary of Defense George C. Marshall, in a directive entitled, "Broadening the Industrial Base of Procurement Programs," stated that "the concentration of contracts with a few leader suppliers is to be avoided unless the necessity therefor is clear." No reasons have yet been advanced by the Defense Department for this necessity for higher concentration of defense contracts during the present emergency than during World War II. This Marshall directive was issued in December 1950, more than 6 months ago, but in the first 5 months of 1951, defense contracts have continued to be heaped on the same small handful of companies in ever-increasing concentration.

By entrusting a large percentage of contracts to a few companies, the Defense Department, although it advocates "the aggressive encouragement or requirement of subcontracting by prime contractors," has no assurance that defense work will filter down to the smaller companies by subcontracts. Recent committee hearings on the participation of small business in the military procurement program gave evidence of the obstacles small business faces in attempting to procure subcontracts. This is explained partly by Defense Mobilizer Wilson's statement that "the military production program is still in the tooling-up stage," that assembly-line production is not yet in full-scale operation, hence subcontracting jobs are not yet plentiful. But there is also evidence that prime contractors are "hoarding" their contracts, refusing to subcontract unless their plants are operating at 100-percent capacity. Small-business men have reported to the committee that these prime contractors have told them: "Our production line is not up to the point yet where we look for additional sources. Don't bother us until 1952 or 1953. Then we may be looking for you." In addition, many of the large contractors are expanding their plant facilities which are being underwritten by rapid tax amortizations, and are holding on to their defense work until these new plants are completed. Investigations show that in many instances subcontractors with existing facilities can handle this defense work which is now piling up in the hands of the big companies while they wait for their new plant facilities to be completed. A full awareness of this tremendous problem should expedite the formation of sound subcontracting policies which will guarantee full participation in our rearmament effort by all segments of our economy and put an immediate end to the construction of duplicating facilities by our industrial concerns when equal or adequate facilities are in existence.

Your committee is not in a position to recommend specific actions which should be taken by military procurement officers at this time to remedy this serious problem. It feels, however, that the proposed Small Defense Plants Administration would be able to make an integrated attack on spreading the industrial base of production and only such an organization can be expected to work out a reasonable solution.

CONCLUSION

From the results of its survey on the Concentration of Defense Contracts in Industry, the Senate Small Business Committee concludes that this trend of concentration of defense contracts must be immediately reversed and defense contracts spread widely in industry to guarantee a broad and growing industrial base, if this top-heavy imbalance is not to undermine our economy, retard our mobilization effort, and entrench monopoly beyond hope of dislodgement in our time.

CHART I

Small Business Committee staff survey on concentration of the prime defense contracts and letters of intent, July 1, 1950–June 1, 1951

Company	Dollar volume of defense contracts	Cumulative percent of total
1. General Motors Corp.	\$3,500,000,000	-----
2. Ford Motor Co.	1,000,000,000	-----
3. Boeing Airplane Co.	960,000,000	-----
4. Curtiss-Wright Corp.	840,240,000	-----
5. Lockheed Aircraft Corp.	674,300,000	-----
6. Republic Aviation Corp.	549,040,000	-----
7. General Electric Co.	500,000,000	-----
8. United Aircraft Corp.	490,000,000	-----
9. North American Aviation, Inc.	481,897,000	-----
10. Grumman Aircraft Engineering Corp.	410,000,000	40
11. International Harvester Co.	355,000,000	-----
12. Western Electric	343,000,000	-----
13. McDonnell	269,000,000	-----
14. Bendix Aviation Corp.	265,000,000	-----
15. Westinghouse Electric & Manufacturing Co.	245,000,000	-----
16. American Locomotive Co.	229,000,000	-----
17. Chrysler Corp.	223,417,000	-----
18. American Woolen Co., Inc.	208,284,000	-----
19. Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co.	200,000,000	-----
20. Packard Motor Car Co.	199,500,000	50
21. Sperry Corp.	198,000,000	-----
22. Nash-Kelvinator Corp.	192,000,000	-----
23. Douglas Aircraft Co., Inc.	172,129,000	-----
24. Consolidated Vultee Aircraft Co., Inc.	152,500,000	-----
25. J. P. Stevens & Co., Inc.	151,900,000	-----
26. Firestone Tire & Rubber Co.	142,041,000	-----
27. Fairchild Engine & Airplane Corp.	127,154,000	-----
28. Bethlehem Steel Co.	127,056,000	-----
29. Bell Aircraft Corp.	125,092,000	-----
30. Food Machinery & Chemical Corp.	125,000,000	56
31. Willys-Overland Motors, Inc.	124,350,000	-----
32. Avco	122,000,000	-----
33. Newport News Shipbuilding Co.	120,400,000	-----
34. Northrup Aircraft, Inc.	119,144,000	-----
35. Glenn L. Martin Co.	108,900,000	-----
36. Radio Corp. of America	108,560,000	-----
37. Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.	108,000,000	-----
38. American Car & Foundry Co.	105,000,000	-----
39. Raytheon Manufacturing Co.	103,500,000	-----
40. Studebaker Corp.	97,845,000	61
41. Beech Aircraft Corp.	86,000,000	-----
42. Standard Oil of New Jersey Affiliates	82,000,000	-----
43. Emerson Electric Manufacturing Co.	75,000,000	-----
44. Kaiser-Frazer	65,550,000	-----
45. Caterpillar Tractor Co.	65,000,000	-----
46. Baldwin Lima Hamilton Corp.	65,000,000	-----
47. United States Rubber Co.	64,000,000	-----
48. Diamond Motor Car Co.	55,000,000	-----
49. United States Steel	55,000,000	-----
50. Eastman Kodak Co.	44,694,000	64

CHART II

TABLE 1.—100 corporations ranked by volume of prime war supply contracts, cumulative June 1940 through September 1944

Corporation	Millions of dollars ¹	Cumulative percent of total
All corporations, total	175,062.9	100.0
100 specified corporations, total	117,634.4	67.2
1. General Motors Corp.	13,812.7	-----
2. Curtiss-Wright Corp.	7,091.0	-----
3. Ford Motor Co.	5,269.6	-----
4. Consolidated Vultee Aircraft Corp.	4,875.4	-----
5. Douglas Aircraft Co., Inc.	4,431.3	-----
6. United Aircraft Corp.	3,923.0	-----
7. Bethlehem Steel Co.	3,789.3	-----
8. Chrysler Corp.	3,394.8	-----
9. General Electric Co.	3,300.1	-----
10. Lockheed Aircraft Corp.	3,246.2	30.4
11. North American Aviation, Inc.	2,768.5	-----
12. Boeing Airplane Co.	2,700.2	-----
13. American Telephone & Telegraph Co.	2,562.7	-----
14. Martin, Glenn L. Co.	2,344.8	-----
15. du Pont, E. I., de Nemours Co., Inc.	2,186.2	-----
16. United States Steel Corp.	1,974.0	-----
17. Bendix Aviation Corp.	1,869.2	-----
18. Packard Motor Car Co.	1,783.8	-----
19. Sperry Corp.	1,531.5	-----
20. Kaiser, Henry J., Co.	1,384.4	42.4
21. Westinghouse Electric & Manufacturing Co.	1,375.7	-----
22. Grumman Aircraft Engineering Corp.	1,330.4	-----
23. Newport News Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co.	1,245.8	-----
24. Republic Aviation Corp.	1,231.5	-----
25. Bell Aircraft Corp.	1,228.3	-----
26. Todd Shipyards Corp.	1,191.9	-----
27. Nash-Kelvinator Corp.	1,162.6	-----
28. Studebaker Corp.	1,143.8	-----
29. Consolidated Steel Corp., Ltd.	1,097.4	-----
30. Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.	1,091.2	49.3
31. Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey	1,053.1	-----
32. Aviation Corp.	1,045.6	-----
33. International Harvester Co.	1,035.8	-----
34. American Locomotive Co.	889.2	-----
35. Western Cartridge Co.	880.5	-----
36. American Car & Foundry Co.	854.9	-----
37. United States Rubber Co.	798.0	-----
38. Continental Motors Corp.	782.9	-----
39. Sun Oil Co.	712.5	-----
40. Baldwin Locomotive Works	712.3	54.3
41. Pressed Steel Car Co., Inc.	664.3	-----
42. Permanente Metals Corp.	635.4	-----
43. Radio Corp. of America	610.0	-----
44. Caterpillar Tractor Co.	602.7	-----
45. Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co.	585.7	-----
46. Norden, Carl J., Inc.	555.2	-----
47. Diamond T Motor Car Co.	535.7	-----
48. Willys-Overland Motors, Inc.	522.2	-----
49. California Shipbuilding Corp.	503.5	-----
50. Bath Iron Works	498.6	57.6
51. American Woolen Co., Inc.	493.9	-----
52. Emerson Electric Manufacturing Co.	487.1	-----
53. Consolidated Builders, Inc.	478.1	-----
54. White Motor Co.	471.6	-----
55. Firestone Tire & Rubber Co.	455.2	-----
56. Pullman, Inc.	455.0	-----
57. Philco Corp.	452.8	-----
58. Anaconda Copper Mining Co.	446.8	-----
59. Federal Cartridge Corp.	439.1	-----
60. Fairbanks-Morse Co.	414.1	60.2
61. Northern Pump Co.	411.1	-----
62. Eastman Kodak Co.	407.6	-----
63. Mack Trucks, Inc.	396.1	-----
64. Food Machinery Corp.	392.2	-----
65. Hercules Powder Co.	366.6	-----
66. Remington Rand, Inc.	359.8	-----
67. Goodrich, B. F., Co.	359.6	-----
68. Brown Shipbuilding Co.	357.1	-----
69. Beach Aircraft Corp.	351.3	-----
70. Higgins Industries, Inc.	349.6	62.4
71. Raytheon Manufacturing Co.	348.8	-----
72. Dravo Corp.	343.7	-----
73. Fairchild Engine & Airplane Corp.	334.1	-----
74. Smith, A. O., Corp.	329.6	-----
75. Standard Oil Co. of California	327.6	-----
76. General Cable Corp.	325.6	-----
77. Electric Boat Co.	324.1	-----
78. Jack & Heintz, Inc.	312.2	-----
79. Royal Dutch Co.	308.1	-----
80. Crucible Steel Co. of America	300.5	64.2

¹ Represents the total face value, as of Sept. 30, 1944, of all prime war supply contracts of \$50,000 and over, exclusive of food, reported to the War Production Board in the period June 1940 through September 1944.

CHART II

TABLE 1.—100 corporations ranked by volume of prime war supply contracts, cumulative June 1940 through September 1944—Con.

Corporation	Millions of dollars	Cumulative percent of total
81. American Shipbuilding Co.....	294.0	-----
82. Moore Dry Dock Co.....	292.2	-----
83. Hudson Motor Car Co.....	290.0	-----
84. Brewster Aeronautical Corp.....	281.8	-----
85. Autocar Co.....	279.5	-----
86. Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc.....	276.5	-----
87. Jacobs Aircraft Engine Co.....	269.4	-----
88. Ingalls Iron Works.....	265.6	-----
89. Western Pipe Steel Co. of California.....	264.3	-----
90. American Can Co.....	261.8	65.8
91. General Machinery Corp.....	261.7	-----
92. Chicago Bridge & Iron Co.....	260.2	-----
93. Texas Co.....	260.1	-----
94. Galvin Manufacturing Corp.....	243.8	-----
95. Stewart-Warner Corp.....	242.6	-----
96. Revere Copper & Brass, Inc.....	241.6	-----
97. New England Shipbuilding Corp.....	235.5	-----
98. Missouri Valley Bridge & Iron Co.....	233.8	-----
99. Colt's Patent Fire Arms Manufacturing Co.....	233.8	-----
100. Northrop Aircraft, Inc.....	232.3	67.2

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Illinois. I am sure the Senator from Illinois is familiar with the large reserve of machine tools which were supposedly protected and husbanded after World War II. I wonder whether the Senator has any information as to what has happened to those machine tools, and whether or not he is aware of the fact that the Bureau of the Budget has been very much disturbed about the desire of the Defense Establishment to procure new machine tools without using those which are already in existence. Has the Senator had any opportunity to inquire into that subject?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; I have not. I welcome the point raised by the Senator from Minnesota, because, as I suggested previously, the Defense Department is proposing the purchase of \$3,000,000,000 worth of additional machinery, tools, and equipment, over and above all the tools it has. It is quite possible that some of the tools are antiquated and not adapted to the artillery, the tanks, and the airplanes which are now being produced. Some of the tools may be obsolete. I do not wish to be censorious in my judgment on this matter, but certainly there is a field for investigation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I realize that the Senator was speaking only recently about a medical program of the armed services, which, of course, as he has pointed out, is something which needs real unification. It has not had real unification. That has been the subject of inquiry before one of the committees. To come back to the procurement picture, in this bill, essentially, besides the moneys appropriated for manpower, we are appropriating for procurement.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. While I am deeply moved by the number of bulletins I receive from the Office of Defense Mobili-

zation and the Department of Defense, and while I have read Secretary Marshall's bulletins on procurement day after day and week after week, and I have read the bulletins and the documents which come from the Munitions Board, nevertheless, the sad fact is that the procurement officers have a set of bulletins in one drawer, and a set of ideas about procurement in another drawer. For their methods they dip out of the idea hoard which they have had for a long period of time, since World War II.

I believe that it is necessary to take into consideration the geographical distribution of defense contracts. I think it is necessary to take into consideration the use of existing plants. Despite all the percentage figures which have been placed in the RECORD—and there are plenty of percentage figures available from the Department of Defense—the sad fact is that there is a greater concentration of defense contracts in the hands of a few companies during this period than there was at any time during World War II, even at the peak of our mobilization. There is a greater concentration of defense production, and there is less utilization of the existing plant in this country, which means that hundreds of small firms are losing their skilled labor and using their reserves, thereby threatening this solvency. At the same time the Government asks for additional billions of dollars for new plants. I think it is about time to call for an inventory of the existing plant facilities and the use of such facilities before we appropriate \$3,000,000,000 for new plants, tools, and equipment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Minnesota speaks my views precisely in this matter. I may add that in considering this subject my primary concern is to make sure we are financing our production program at the lowest possible cost; it may be, particularly in the case of equipment that has probable postemergency usefulness, that the equipment could be financed more effectively by accelerated amortization certificates or by a loan guaranty, rather than by Government purchase of the equipment. It is my hope that if we reduce these funds, the military will explore these alternative means more fully. For the moment, I am not so much concerned with the geographical distribution of this aid, or the participation of small business and big business, although, as I said, the small-business aspect of this program interests me very much. I am primarily concerned with getting value for Uncle Sam.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not want my remarks to be misunderstood. I recognize that there is need for new equipment. I recognize the fact that there have been advances in science and technology. I do not believe that one should make blanket charges. I merely appeal, as the Senator from Illinois has done,

for the proper utilization of that which we have.

The Senator said that he was not too much concerned about geographical distribution, and I believe I know what he means.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I said that the primary purpose should be the reduction in cost, to the taxpayer of financing our facilities expansion program.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I agree with the Senator that the primary purpose should be the reduction in cost. However, I also say that when the Government of the United States authorizes \$61,000,000,000, or, in this instance, in this year \$45,000,000,000 of estimated expenditures for defense, it is not money that can be talked about in the abstract. It fundamentally affects our whole economy. In my own State I found that the Government of the United States prior to Korea used to make purchases which amounted to 3 percent of the total business of the State. Now it is less than 2 percent. We are losing our skilled labor, and we have not been able to utilize our existing plants, with the result that a few industries within the State are the only ones who have any Government contracts. I am not appealing on the basis of prejudice in behalf of small industry, but I say that the bills for all these expenditures cannot be paid by a few major plants. Production must be distributed. Plants must be used, and the labor force maintained as a producing force.

Mr. DOUGLAS. My feeling about a very large percentage of procurement officers is that they have exercised with complete literalness the command:

For unto every one that hath shall be given, and he shall have abundance: but from him that hath not shall be taken away even that which he hath.

I believe it would be well if they were not so literal in following that command of our Lord and Saviour, and that it would be better for them to spread out the business, particularly if they were zealously seeking the utmost economy in placing contracts. When I find procurement officers dealing out small businesses, and excluding them by one device or another, I wonder if they do not also at times exclude low bidders, as well as small bidders.

Mr. President, I do not wish to prolong the discussion, but any argument is only as strong as its individual links. I should like to point out that there is a naval air station at Pensacola, Fla., which has been getting its medical supplies from its depot at Edgewater, N. J., although there is an Army medical depot in Atlanta. The station at Pensacola bypasses Atlanta and goes up to New Jersey, merely because there is a naval medical depot in New Jersey. There is an Army facility in New Jersey very near boring naval medical depot, but, instead, goes up to Schenectady, N. Y., to get them. I am told that at the insistence of the House Committee on Expenditures, after a very competent in-

vestigation of this problem, the facilities are finally being consolidated in the southeastern United States, but I will believe it when I see it has been accomplished.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I know the Senator wants to have the RECORD accurate. The fact is that last year the Army and Navy pooled the purchasing of their medical supplies.

Mr. DOUGLAS. They have pooled purchase, but have they also pooled the storage of medical supplies?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Perhaps they have not pooled the storage and warehousing of medical supplies, but at least they have pooled the procurement of medical supplies, which is a step in the right direction. That is my understanding of the testimony when we had the Veterans' Administration hospital program before our committee. We tried to get the Veterans' Administration to join with the military services.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes; I shall be glad to yield for a question.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am prompted to ask the Senator from Illinois to allow me to interrupt him because of the comment of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], with respect to pooling of purchasing of medical supplies. I was very glad that he made that statement. It is indicative of what has been going on throughout the Military Establishment. There has been a very substantial attempt made to eliminate all sorts of competition among the various armed services. The Quartermaster Corps, for example, purchases subsistence items for both the Navy and Air Force. The engineers make certain combined purchases. In that way there is an elimination of competition between the services in production, a standardization of equipment, and a saving of the appropriation dollar.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to have the Senator's comment, but I should like to give some further illustrations of what I regret in the military budget.

NATIONAL ADVERTISING EXPENDITURES FOR RECRUITMENT

In the budget will be found an item of \$3,000,000 for national advertising for recruiting purposes. That is something that, in my opinion, should be donated by the newspapers and magazines of the country which are being subsidized with second-class mailing privileges. It should not be necessary to appropriate \$3,000,000 for that purpose. I suppose an advertising commission comes out of that amount. That commission is usually 15 percent.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The advertising commission is usually 15 percent, therefore an advertising firm will probably get \$450,000 in commissions. That amount should be a donated item, not an expense item. I now yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. May I ask the distinguished Senator from Illinois whether he sees any reason why we should maintain a recruiting service in view of the manpower laws in effect at the present time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I suppose there is always a certain amount of psychological advantage in having men enlist, instead of having them drafted, because in a sense the man who enlists comes in with greater zest than the one who is hauled in by the scruff of his neck through the draft—if our inductee barometer is any indication. I never felt that it should be necessary to have only a passive citizenry, merely coming into the service when it is drafted for military duty. However, I do not believe we should have to spend \$3,000,000 for publicity.

Mr. CASE. The Senator from Illinois, because of his record in the military service, undoubtedly responded to the lure of the Marine Corps.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It was the best thing I ever did in my life, I may say.

Mr. CASE. Having served in the Marine Corps myself, I do not quarrel with the Senator from Illinois. I wonder whether it would be necessary to appropriate money for advertising for recruiting purposes. I have had called to my attention the fact that the services are now writing to young men, soliciting them, after they have received their preliminary notice from the draft boards. It is very disruptive of the machinery of the Selective Service.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I believe the Senator from South Dakota has reference to letters which were sent out by recruiting officers of the Marine Corps.

Mr. CASE. No; this does not have to do with the Marine Corps.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am delighted to hear it.

Mr. CASE. It involves another service.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not believe that there should be such solicitation.

Mr. CASE. The observation that was made to me by persons who have observed the work of the Selective Service is that it results in an interference with the orderly calling of boys after they have received their first notice. It is necessary to send out a second call to the local draft boards. I have no objection to boys responding to the appeal of a special armed service if they want to do so in advance of receiving their first call from the draft board, but after they get their notice it seems to me that the selective service machinery might well be allowed to function, and thus save the expense of the individual solicitation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad the Senator from South Dakota agrees with me. The item of \$3,000,000, of which I believe \$450,000 is an advertising fee, should be eliminated.

SIXTEEN MILLION DOLLARS FOR ADDITIONAL GUARD ARMORIES

Then there is an item of \$16,000,000 for the building of more armories for the National Guard. Mr. President, I submit that it is not needed. We have called up most of the organized reserves anyway. There will not be much en-

thusiasm on the part of men to join the Organized Reserves after what has happened in Korea. The National Guard already has armories. The chief function of the additional armories would be to provide a drill hall one night a week for the Organized Reserves, if we could get them, and to provide a place at which to hold the Jefferson-Jackson Day annual dinner in the locality, to raise money at \$100 a plate. [Laughter.]

I am all for the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinners, but I do not think we need to build armories in which to hold them. Even if there were to be Hamilton-Lincoln Day dinners, I would be just as much opposed, or perhaps even more opposed, to having armories built for that purpose, Mr. President.

So there is \$16,000,000 more which can be eliminated.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUNT in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Inasmuch as the Senator who has been addressing the Senate comes from the State of Illinois, I wonder whether he wishes the RECORD to indicate that he has any objection to having dinners held in memory of Lincoln?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Oh, certainly not; but I do not believe we should build armories in order to use them for the serving of such quasi-political dinners at a charge of anywhere from \$25 to \$100 a plate.

Mr. CASE. The Senator from Illinois misunderstands me. When we Republicans hold the Lincoln Day dinners, we do not charge \$25 or \$100 or \$125 a plate. We hold \$1 box suppers at the Uline Arena. I would be pleased to have the Senator from Illinois join us there sometime and realize that he could get his dinner for \$1, instead of \$100 or \$125.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I have tried to make this discussion non-political and I have tried to say that even for my own party I do not believe we need to build armories in which to hold such dinners. Now, perhaps I may be forgiven if I say that perhaps the Republican dinners at \$1 a box are more or less "come-on" affairs which are held for the purpose of inducing persons who are not of the common folk to go there and become persuaded to make large contributions.

I see that perhaps the Senator is taking umbrage at what I am saying, but I entered this phase of the discussion only upon provocation, I may say.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If the only criticism the Senator can make of the proposed appropriation for the Defense Establishment comes down to a description of whether a dinner should cost \$100 a plate or \$1 a plate, I am very pleased.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am sorry the discussion has turned into this channel.

My point is that the proposed armories are not needed at the present time, inas-

much as many vacant drill halls are available for the training of the reserves. In any case, about all that can be done in a drill hall is to engage in close-order drill and perhaps some instruction regarding military discipline. In order really to train an army, there must be training in the field, extended maneuvers and training in the specialties.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am sorry that I did not hear all the discussion.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I said that \$16,000,000 is proposed to be appropriated for the construction of additional armories, and I think that item really is not justified.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In that connection, I shall not try to justify the entire expenditure, but I wish to say that in Massachusetts, when I was in the Governor's office, the great problem we found in connection with armories was that the type of armories needed had changed. For instance, there is the question of whether it is wise to leave a tank outdoors all the time, and we are faced with the question of what is to be done with large Army trucks and the question of how to store a bazooka. All those questions arise.

In Massachusetts we found that if the military groups are to have opportunities to train and to store in a proper way the necessary materials, the type of armory needed for those purposes is quite different from the old type of armory.

PURCHASE OF ADMINISTRATIVE AIRCRAFT BY THE NAVY

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I should like to mention another item which looks somewhat dubious to me, namely, the proposed purchase of 95 new airplanes for the Navy, to be used purely for administrative purposes, and to cost \$2,225,000 apiece, for a total cost of approximately \$215,000,000. Those are to be luxury planes, similar to commercial planes. Their cost compares with the cost of \$3,500,000 for a huge B-36.

I think there is a very real question whether we need as many additional new planes as those for the transportation of naval personnel, because, for one thing, if there is one kind of travel orders of which there is an excess it is the kind entitling the bearer to air transportation. Everyone wishes to have air transportation in order to move quickly. Also, a certain prestige is involved in connection with traveling by air. The pressure upon the adjutants and the others in the various units to authorize transportation by air is very heavy. If we provide additional planes at \$2,225,000 apiece, we provide the capacity for increased travel by air, and then perhaps we shall find not only an additional number of generals, but also colonels, lieutenant-colonels, majors, captains, lieutenants—yes, also sergeants and corporals and privates, who will be riding around the country in airplanes.

So I think we should scrutinize with great care the item of \$215,000,000 for additional transportation planes for the Navy.

ATTITUDE OF THE NAVY TOWARD CROSS-SERVICING IN SUPPLY

Mr. President, if I may double back upon myself, let me say that the statement has been made that the armed services are making great progress in unifying their supply systems. In that connection I should like to read from a statement made by the Secretary of the Navy as of May 25 of this year. That statement appears on page 457 of a document entitled "Field Conferences on Federal Supply Management," held by a subcommittee of the House of Representatives Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, Eighty-second Congress, first session. In a statement prepared for that subcommittee, the Secretary of the Navy said the following:

Obviously, any extensive employment of cross servicing in materials distribution would completely disrupt the existing Navy supply system.

That statement does not indicate that there is any real desire on the part of the Navy to integrate the supply systems of the services.

Mr. President, I have spoken at what many persons may believe to be excessive length. It has been a tiring and a disagreeable duty.

I desire to reiterate that I would not reduce by one jot or tittle the armed effectiveness of this country. On the contrary, I believe it probably should be increased above the total provided for in the schedule under which the armed services are operating.

Although my knowledge is imperfect and incomplete and although undoubtedly there are some errors in the presentation I have made, I think I have been able to indicate sufficient examples and have been able to present an argument sufficient to show that we could save money for the taxpayers, and thereby could reduce the danger of inflation, without reducing in the slightest the military effectiveness of this country.

As a matter of fact, if we cut down on supply and administration, in some respects we give to the men in the combat units the feeling that they are not deserted. If there is one thing that depresses the mind of a man in a rifle company, it is the knowledge that he takes the risks, suffers the death or the wounds, and experiences the hardships, but the men in the rear live in quasi-luxury and in safety. That is the most dispiriting factor upon morale, and it is something which the high brass of the Army and the Navy have not sufficiently considered, or, if they have considered it, have not used adequate means to cure.

So, Mr. President, I shall propose a series of amendments providing savings which total approximately \$600,000,000. I hope that by morning I may have other amendments.

I remind the Senate that the House of Representatives has reduced the total carried by the bill by a billion and a half dollars, of which I suppose only about \$1,000,000,000 constitute real savings.

So it seems to me that we should set our goal at somewhere around real savings of \$2,000,000,000. Probably much

more than that could be saved if we would have the whole-hearted cooperation not merely of the men at the top of the armed services, but also of the men in the intermediate and lower echelons.

However, the amendments I intend to propose would be a beginning, and I think it would inculcate a healthy feeling that in this Republic the civil authorities and representative bodies are still supreme, at least for the present.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

VISIT TO THE SENATE OF FRENCH TEXTILE WORKERS, DYERS, AND FINISHERS

During the delivery of Mr. DOUGLAS' speech,

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BENTON. I ask permission that the Senator may yield 1 minute to me, without losing the floor thereby.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUNT in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Connecticut? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Connecticut is recognized.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate to the group of 18 men in the Senate gallery, on the left side of the Presiding Officer, whom I have just met and with whom I have been chatting. These are French textile dyers and finishers who are here under ECA's most important and productive technical-assistance program. They have just returned from nearly 2 months in the South where they have visited 15 of our American textile plants. In South Carolina they attended an institute at Clemson College. They are now on their way back to France. I have been speaking to them about the important part the free labor union movement in this country has played in helping us develop our high standards of productivity and for which we are the envy of the world. I have contrasted our free labor unions with the powerful Communist-dominated unions which have achieved such great importance in France, Italy, and in certain other European countries.

Mr. President, I know I am speaking for all of my colleagues when I welcome to the Senate today these friends from France. I know that when I welcome them today I do so also on behalf of our Presiding Officer.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Illinois for yielding to me.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5054) making appropriations for the National Security Council, the National Security Resources Board, and for military functions administered by the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I think it only proper for me to say that in general I agree with the remarks of the Senator from Illinois. Undoubtedly military appropriations always contain waste, but war itself is waste. War is the most stupendous folly in which mankind has ever indulged. We are living in an age in which we are apparently drifting into a third world war, while we have not yet paid the debts of World War II, nor, indeed, all of the debts of World War I.

This country launched itself upon a completely new theory of international understanding and agreement when, during the Eightieth Congress, it adopted the Marshall plan, authorizing the expenditure of billions of dollars for building up the war-torn areas of Europe and the world, in order to reverse the whole trend of human folly through all the pages of written history and substitute the philosophy of the builder for that of the destroyer. Only last week there was signed in San Francisco a treaty with Japan which may not be perfect, but which was an attempt to sign an agreement among nations which were at war, a treaty based not at all upon any thought of revenge.

The people of the United States, in their passionate desire to lead the world to peace, have given an example to all the peoples of the world of a desire to escape from war—from its waste, its destruction, its disaster, and everything that goes with it. But I should not like to have any person reading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD tomorrow morning gather, from what my friend from Illinois has said, that the men in uniform are lacking in a comprehension of their obligation to the people of the United States. I should not like to have Congress think, I should not like to have Members of the Senate or House, or those who may be listening in the galleries, think that the men who wear the uniform of the United States, whether it be in the Air Force, in the Army, in the Navy, or in the Marine Corps, are wilfully making more mistakes than those which are made by all human beings from time to time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. We cannot take every dollar of waste out of this bill because waste is inherent in war and preparation for war. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say that the remarks just made by the Senator from Wyoming emphasize what I have already said, namely that many, including the Senator from Illinois, find themselves very reluctant to criticize the military, because every time we offer suggestions as to how money could be saved, or suggest that there is excess personnel in the departments, then the implication is made that we are somehow attacking the character or the patriotism of men in the departments. No one wishes to do that. No one wishes to be represented as doing it; and the Senator from Wyoming has just shown how difficult it is for the Members of the Senate to propose ways of effecting economies in

good faith; because, when as fine a Senator as the Senator from Wyoming implies that criticism of these items constitutes criticism of the character and patriotism of the members of the service, it naturally acts as a silencer on people who think—

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator will permit me to say that nothing that I said justifies that implication. I do not make that implication, and it should not be read into my remarks. I have too much regard for the Senator to make it. I am merely expressing the hope that no one will draw the implication from what the Senator from Illinois has said, that he is making a blanket charge against the men in uniform; because the Senator is not doing that.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am not, of course, making any such blanket charge. I am in no sense making the charge. I was very careful all along to indicate my high opinion of these men. I simply wanted to point out that they make human mistakes, and that there is a certain percentage of them who yield to temptation, as there are among citizens outside the men in uniforms; that it is one of the functions of a representative body to try to reduce those mistakes as much as possible and that true patriotism does not consist of ceding our responsibility and in giving everyone else a blank check. It involves working with them to try to eliminate waste and at the same time provide security.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator, of course, is quite right in that. But again I say my purpose in rising now is to make clear that he was not intending to attack the patriotism or the devotion of these men in uniform, whether they are in high position or in low position.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Of course, I did not intend that.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator will permit me—

Mr. DOUGLAS. And neither do I wish—

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator will please permit me to continue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming has the floor.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I sat for weeks listening to the testimony on this bill, and I have come in close contact with the evidences of the devotion of our men in the armed services. Of course, I agree with the Senator from Illinois that there are unworthy men in uniform, just as there are unworthy individuals in every calling. But I want to make it perfectly clear—and I am glad that the Senator from Illinois has interrupted me, to help make it clear—that there is no blanket indictment here of our men in uniform. If I were to keep silent, I can imagine the words of the Senator from Illinois being read tomorrow morning, and, by some representative of Tass, being broadcast behind the iron curtain misinterpreting his meaning to indicate a lack of faith among American Members of Congress in the men who work, who fight, and who die for them.

I want to say that Gen. Lawton Collins has a deep regard for every soldier who wears the uniform. I have no doubt that Admiral Fechteler has a deep regard for

every gob in the Navy. I know that Gen. Hoyt Vandenberg, in order to be sure how the soldiers and the Air Force were getting along in Korea, flew in a helicopter into the very front lines of the enemy to see what the condition was just as General Collins went to the fighting front. Let no one rise on this floor and, with a broad brush, attempt to paint a picture of a lack of devotion, of crookedness, of waste on the part of our people in the armed services. There are some who waste money, of course, and those persons should be prosecuted and placed behind prison bars when they violate the law. I wanted to make it clear to the Senator from Illinois and to all who are here on the floor this afternoon, that the Committee on Appropriations is not at all blind to the fact that all war is waste, and that dollars can be wasted; but I want the RECORD to show, Mr. President, that this committee is already in correspondence with the armed services for the express purpose of cooperating with the Defense Department in closing the doors to waste and extravagance.

I want the RECORD to show that the Senate and House Committees on the Armed Services and all the members thereof are closely studying the expenditure of these funds and the laws and rules under which they may be expended. There are appropriations in the bill to carry on activities to which I myself would not give my personal consent, but it was the judgment of the Congress in the enactment of certain laws that these appropriations should be authorized, and, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, I would not undertake to upset our program under laws passed by the Congress to define those programs and procedures.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Does not the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, with the great responsibility which is on his shoulders, feel that there are men who would question honestly, as I think they have been questioned, some of the practices which result in undue extravagance in spending the taxpayers' money for the defense of this country, as suggested by the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course; and I do not criticize the Senator from Illinois. I have always admired him. But I do not want any misinterpretation of what was said to go out. I have no doubt that amendments can be made to this bill; I have no doubt about that at all; but I want the Members of the Senate to know that this is a continuing job. We are here dealing with an appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1952, and we are now in the 10th day of September. The fiscal year began on the 1st of July. We are already almost 3 months into the fiscal year. There are some things which ought to be corrected and which I hope will be corrected.

Earlier in the day I announced that the subcommittee had already undertaken to call for the Department of Defense to study closely and report to us the staffing of various forces. As chair-

man of the subcommittee, I am planning to call upon the Inspector General of the Army to come before the subcommittee and show what steps the Inspector General of the Army takes to prevent waste and extravagance and abuse of authority.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have no objection to that. I was going to conclude my brief remarks and then ask that we proceed to the consideration of committee amendments.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this time?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It seems to me that the hour is getting late for the consideration of amendments about which any Senator would care to make any remarks this afternoon, and I wondered whether, when the clerk started to state the committee amendments, if that were done this afternoon, the Senator would agree to have it done with the understanding that any committee amendment which might be adopted and to which any Senator wished to offer an amendment tomorrow, or before the consideration of the bill is completed, could be treated as though it had not been acted upon.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly. There are many amendments in the bill to which there will be no objection, I am sure, and I was hoping the Senate would consent to sit until 6 o'clock to see if we cannot adopt some of the amendments to which I know there will be no objection.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I know there are some Members of the Senate who want to speak on amendments, and if the chairman of the subcommittee is willing to agree to adopt this afternoon the committee amendments and consider any of them to which an amendment is offered as not having been acted upon, I think it would be well. On the other hand, if the Senator is not willing to have such an understanding, I agree that a quorum call should be had before the amendments are taken up.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I yield the floor, if any Senator desires to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. CASE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLEMENTS in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded, and that further proceedings under the call be vacated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, it is with some hesitation that I venture to speak at this time on this particular subject, but what has happened this afternoon calls for something to be said.

I do not wish to appear boastful, and I mention it only as a background for what I am about to say. I dealt with military appropriations for 9 years, from

1940 on, as a member of the House subcommittee dealing with War Department appropriations. I mentioned the years 1940 to 1949 because those years were the ones in which we were building up our defenses and making appropriations for the prosecution of the war. The War Department at that time embraced the Army and the Air Force, so that the appropriations involved were those of the Army and the Air Force. During a portion of the time I served in some instances on the deficiency committee which dealt with appropriations for the Navy.

I say as a matter of personal experience, Mr. President, that the moment anyone ventures to raise a word of criticism or a word of question or a word of doubt about the amount of money asked for by any branch of the military service, then it becomes an easy defense on the part of those defending budget estimates, to imply that anyone who questions them in any particular is in some way giving comfort and aid to the enemy. Mr. President, I am as certain as I stand here today that the distinguished Senator from Wyoming really does not want to imply that the Senator from Illinois, in voicing the doubts he has voiced today in regard to specific proposals for appropriations, intended in any way to give any comfort or aid to the enemy.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course, I had no such intention. I do not believe anything I said implied that I had any such feeling with respect to what the Senator from Illinois said. I have had the greatest regard and admiration for the Senator from Illinois. But I wanted to make it clear for the RECORD that some of the things which we were discussing this afternoon are matters of statutory law and not within the jurisdiction of the Appropriation Committee. Of course, I said explicitly at the very beginning that I have no doubt in the world that money will be wasted and is being wasted in this military effort, and I welcome in particular any effort, any attempt, upon the part of anybody to help hold down expenditures. I compliment the Senator from Illinois for his desire to hold expenditures down, but his amendments have not yet been offered.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I am happy that by taking the floor I have given an opportunity for the Senator from Wyoming to make that statement, because I know from what has happened here and the remarks I heard in the lobby a moment ago that the Senator from Illinois did not so understand the remarks, and felt that the remarks of the Senator from Wyoming had implied that he was giving comfort and aid to the enemy. I know there was no such intent on the part of the Senator from Wyoming. But, Mr. President, unless we can save some money on the defense budget we are not going to make any material savings in the budget proposals of the President.

I have in my hand from the editorial page of the Washington Daily News of Saturday, August 25, an editorial en-

titled "Prices and Palaver," which deals with the President's message with respect to controls. The final paragraph of the editorial is as follows:

Strong controls over the economy are necessary in times of huge, abnormal defense spending.

But it takes more than price controls to block inflation. It takes a cutback in non-defense spending by the Government.

That is the statement in the editorial: "It takes a cutback in nondefense spending by the Government."

If we are going to block inflation it will take a cutback in defense spending also, for defense spending, it must be recognized, is the most inflationary form of spending. Money spent for military goods turns loose more dollars to compete for consumers goods, and that is the essential of the greatest inflation. Unless we can find some way of stopping the flow of dollars, large dollars in defense spending, we are not going to block inflation.

This editorial and many other editorials along that line in the past few weeks have referred to appropriations for flood control and rivers and harbors, and many persons have said we should cut down the pork-barrel expenditures for rivers and harbors, as if they were inflationary. But, Mr. President, the experience in Kansas and Missouri, where crops were destroyed, where 30,000 animals were drowned, where foodstuffs were consumed by the flood waters, ought to make it clear that floods are inflationary, and that the dollars spent to prevent or control floods are noninflationary in that sense, because the destruction of consumer goods certainly means there are fewer consumer goods for which the dollars can be spent, and that necessarily dries up the competition and drives up the prices.

Mr. President, in these few briefs and extemporaneous remarks this afternoon I want to nail down the thought that if we want to block inflation we must save spending all along the line wherever it can be done, including the spending of dollars on military expenditures for the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force. We will not do the job by saving \$5,000,000 on this bill and \$5,000,000 on some other bill, when we are dealing with a budget that runs up \$100,000,000,000, and when \$61,000,000,000 or more of the \$100,000,000,000 budget is for military spending. It must be realized that if we are going to hold down spending and block inflation, we have to save money where the big money is.

The distinguished Senator from Wyoming himself some time ago made a remark on the Senate floor to that effect. I was hoping that when the bill came to the Senate the markdown by the committee would reflect that statement which he made. If the bill is not marked down when it comes to us, then it becomes the duty of the Senate to give careful deliberation and consideration to the body of the bill and the amendments proposed by the committee, to the amendments which may be proposed by Members of the Senate, and to take such action as will result in substantial savings.

So I commend the Senator from Illinois or any other Senator who will have the nerve and the tenacity and the courage and the studiousness to address himself to possible savings in this bill, the military bill, as well as any other bill, for it is only as we do that, Mr. President, that we can think of reducing the budget or think of blocking or countering inflation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that any amendment which may be agreed to this afternoon, upon the reading of the committee amendments, may be automatically reconsidered tomorrow if any Senate Member not present now should care to raise any question with respect to it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. May I ask the Chair if such an understanding as the Senator from Wyoming proposes, and which I think the Members on this side of the aisle who are present approve of, does not require unanimous consent?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have just made the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I beg the Senator's pardon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would say that the Senator from Wyoming made such a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Will the Chair please state his understanding of the question so there will be no misunderstanding?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the proposed agreement, it is the understanding of the Chair that any committee amendment which may be adopted today will be subject to being reopened and reconsidered tomorrow.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Without a motion to reconsider?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without a motion to reconsider.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In other words, it would be considered as though it had not been acted upon, and any Member could offer an amendment, which would be considered an amendment in the first degree?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the understanding of the Chair.

Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wyoming? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the committee amendments be first considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will state the first committee amendment.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Department of Defense—Military Functions—Title II—Office of the Secretary of Defense—Salaries and Expenses," on page 3, line 15, after the word "conclusive", to strike out "\$13,800,000" and insert "\$14,450,000."

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, may we have some statement as to why this item should be increased?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, this increase is made for the purpose of allowing 115 more man-years of civilian personal service in the office of the Secretary of Defense than was allowed by the House. It is still below the budget. The original estimate was 2,036. The House bill allowed 1,859. The proposed amendment would increase that by 115.

In this connection, the committee has written into the bill an over-all ceiling on civilian graded employees, so that this will be within the ceiling.

Mr. CASE. I appreciate the statement of the Senator from Wyoming, but that does not tell us why the Secretary needs 115 more man-years.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The need arises because of the fact that the Secretary of Defense is the central officer governing the entire expenditure of this huge fund in three departments of the armed services. I know from personal contact with the Secretary of Defense and his aides that they have been working day and night, and that the additional civilian employees are very much needed. The activities listed before the committee do not include personnel in public information, I may say. The committee has made a substantial reduction in the public information appropriation, and I assure the Senator that every effort has been made to hold down civilian employment in the department.

Mr. CASE and Mr. KEM addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield; and, if so, to whom?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield first to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, would it be possible to modify the existing unanimous-consent agreement so that amendments which propose increases in funds, and therefore lend themselves to possible controversy, may be carried over until tomorrow? I understand that the Senator wants to take up the non-controversial amendments tonight, but it seems to me that an amendment which proposes an increase of \$650,000 on a \$13,000,000 item is not inconsequential, particularly when it is for increasing civilian personnel. It is controversial.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, there are several amendments in the bill which make some increases, but they are very minor in total effect. Except for the increase which the committee made for the expansion of air power, the bill carries a net increase by the Senate of \$69,138,830 above the House figure. In other words, as against the background of the huge appropriation, the items of increase are very small. In one case, in connection with Army ordnance, we made a reduction of more than \$225,000,000.

I have no objection to the amendment being passed over if any Senator wishes to have it passed over.

Mr. CASE. Either that, or I should like to rise in opposition to it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is quite all right. I have no objection to the amendment being passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment on page 3, line 15, will be passed over.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. KEM. Did the committee assure itself that the services to be performed by civilian employees could not be performed by personnel in the Armed Forces?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think the committee was unanimously of the belief that military personnel should be assigned to military duties.

Mr. KEM. Are not these duties of a military character?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No. This is administrative and managerial work.

Mr. KEM. Are not many members of the Armed Forces engaged in that kind of work?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; but we are trying to get them out of that work so that they may perform military duty.

Mr. KEM. Would not that add to the expense?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No. I think it would decrease the expense.

Mr. KEM. Would the salaries be less for civilian workers than if the work were performed by armed services personnel?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes, indeed; on the whole, considering the quality of the personnel and the work to be performed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Retired Pay," on page 4, line 20, after the figures "\$345,000,000", to strike out the colon and the following proviso:

Provided, That no part of such sum shall be used to pay the retired or retirement pay of any member of the Regular Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Air Force who is retired after the date of enactment of this act, unless such member was retired because of (1) being unfit to perform the duties of his office, rank, grade, or rating by reason of a physical disability incurred in line of duty, or (2) achieving the age at which retirement is required by law.

The amendment was agreed to.
The next amendment was, on page 5, after line 20, to insert:

NATIONAL EMERGENCY FUND

For transfer by the Secretary of Defense for urgent military requirements, after consultation with the Joint Chiefs of Staff and with the approval of the President, to any appropriation for military functions under the Department of Defense, to be expended to expedite the procurement and facility programs of the Department of Defense necessary to provide for an expansion of air power and necessary supporting forces for the United States Air Force and the United States Navy to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes, and for the same time period, as the appropriation to which transferred, \$500,000,000 for expenditure during fiscal year 1952 and thereafter and \$4,500,000,000 for expenditure during fiscal year 1953 and thereafter for the purposes authorized in this paragraph: *Provided*, That the limitation on the availability of any ap-

appropriation to which transfers are made hereunder is hereby increased by the amount of any such transfers: *Provided further*, That a report of transfers proposed under this item shall be made to the Appropriations Committees and the Armed Services Committees of the Congress 10 days prior to the actual transfer.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of the Army—Title III—Finance Corps—Pay of the Army," on page 11, line 13, after the word "purpose", to insert a colon and the following additional provisos:

Provided further, That all payments for accrued leave made to enlisted members, discharged for the purpose of immediate reenlistment for an indefinite period, at Fort Myer, Va., during the period April 1 to September 30, 1949, both dates inclusive, are hereby validated notwithstanding the provisions of section 4 (c) of the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946, as amended by the act of August 4, 1947 (Public Law 350, 80th Cong.): *Provided further*, That where such erroneous payments of accrued leave have been collected by, or refunded to, the United States, reimbursement thereof shall be effected by the General Accounting Office upon receipt of a claim therefor from the said member or that person or persons entitled to receive the arrears of pay of such member in accordance with the act of June 30, 1906, as amended, 10 U. S. C. 868; *Provided further*, That the Comptroller General of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to allow credit in the accounts of disbursing officers for any payments validated hereby;

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the clerk was reading rapidly. With respect to the amendment on page 4 which would remove the limitation on the use of retirement pay, it was impossible for me to get the full purport of the amendment until I had read it. If I may revert to that amendment for a moment and ask the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee handling the bill a question, why is it necessary to strike the limitation on the use of funds for retirement pay?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The reason for that amendment is that the provision in the House bill, which was adopted on the floor, is not practical of enforcement. It would be particularly onerous on enlisted personnel. There is no retirement age for enlisted personnel. So an enlisted man who ought to be retired because of age or length of service, if he were physically fit could not be retired. He would have to be retired, but he could not be paid. The proviso is particularly undesirable, it was said, as applied to enlisted personnel. There is no retirement for age prescribed in the law. Should the provision become law, enlisted personnel, no matter how old or how long they had served, could not be retired and paid retirement pay, except for physical disability. It is quite possible that an enlisted man might attain a considerable age without being unfit to perform the duty of his office, rank, grade, or rating, within the meaning of the disability retirement provisions of existing law.

With respect to officers, the existing statutes provide for involuntary retirement, of officers for age, for length of

service, or for failure to qualify for promotion; and these provisions of the law were designed to permit a flow of promotion of qualified officers through the services.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It is my understanding that one of the inducements to try to get men in the enlisted ranks to make a career of the Army was to offer certain opportunities for retirement. If the provision in the House bill should prevail, it is my understanding that one of the inducements to longer enlistments would be eliminated, because a man would have to become physically unfit for service before he could be retired with pay.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is quite right.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. CASE. The point which has been brought out by the Senator from Wyoming and the Senator from Massachusetts is good so far as it goes. That is, it is desirable to provide for carrying out the retirement provisions relating to length of service in the armed services. However, Senators are certainly aware of the fact that retirement for physical disability has become more or less of a joke. Only a few years ago a committee of the Congress conducted an investigation into that subject. Instances were brought to the attention of Members of Congress in which members of the armed services—but more particularly officers, rather than enlisted men—would receive a physical examination and obtain retirement benefits far in excess of the amount they could obtain had they received compensation from the Veterans' Administration because of disabilities incurred in line of service.

In years gone by most Senators have had some incidents brought to their attention relative to the subject. A correction for the defect in the amendment could be made, it seems to me, by adding a third clause to provide, in effect: "or having served the requisite number of years provided below for earned retirement."

If that condition had been added the amendment would have been workable, at least so far as the points raised by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are concerned.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The committee was unanimous in its action on this provision. It would be quite possible, however, if any change should be decided in the amendment, to work it out in conference. That is why we struck it out altogether, although the testimony presented by the Department of Defense was all to the effect that the amendment should be stricken out. It is legislative in character, and if there is to be any change in the method of retirement, the age of retirement, and the purpose of retirement, the committee felt it ought to be considered and worked out by the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. CASE. The Senator from Wyoming makes two suggestions. One raises my hopes, and the other dashes them to the ground. The first suggestion was the hope that in conference something might be done to make the amendment workable. However, when the Senator from Wyoming adds to that observation the suggestion that it ought to be handled by a legislative committee he makes me think that probably there is no hope for it. The amendment has been agreed to, Mr. President, but I hope that the Senator from Wyoming will adhere to his first observation, namely, that consideration will be given in conference to making the amendment workable. I leave with the Senator from Wyoming the suggestion that when the amendment goes to conference, the conference consider the third clause, which would permit retirement where retirement is earned by length of service which would be consistent with the promises made for the purpose of getting reenlistments and inducing enlistment in the first place.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall be glad to call the attention of the conferees to the Senator's suggestion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Quartermaster Corps—Quartermaster Service, Army—Clothing and Equipage," on page 17, line 21, after the word "internment", to strike out \$1,506,681,000 and insert "\$1,639,081,000."

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the item?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Section 405 (d) of the National Security Act, as amended, was adopted at the suggestion of the Hoover Commission. It was designed to provide an improved management system in the Office of the Quartermaster General. Before our committee acted we submitted the matter to the Comptroller General, asking for his opinion. I have a letter before me from the Comptroller General, addressed to me as chairman of the subcommittee. It was written by Mr. Lindsay C. Warren, Comptroller General of the United States. It states:

I have your letter of August 18, 1951, requesting my opinion—

And so forth.

Enactment of the quoted proviso would effectively eliminate the broad latitude and authority vested in the Secretary of Defense by section 405 of the National Security Act of 1947, as added by the National Security Act amendments of 1949, to establish working capital funds. Its effect, therefore, would be to require the Department to secure specific congressional authorization through normal appropriation processes for the establishment and operation of each individual fund. In my letter of May 4, 1949, B-85820, to the Chairman of the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate, I endorsed the provisions of those amendments as constituting a framework for constructive efforts in the Department of Defense toward fundamental and urgently needed reforms in the budgeting and accounting structure of that Department.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the entire letter printed in

the RECORD at this point, together with the letter referred to, of May 4, 1949.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LETTERS FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL
COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE
UNITED STATES,
Washington, August 28, 1951.

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Armed
Services, Committee on Appropriations,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I have your letter of August 18, 1951, requesting my opinion of the effect of the new proviso in H. R. 5054, Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1952, on the objectives of business management and efficient control over the utilization of defense inventories. The proviso, at page 16 under the heading "Quartermaster Corps, clothing and equipage," reads as follows: "Provided, That none of the funds appropriated in this or any other act, and none of the property procured therewith, shall be available for transfer to any working-capital fund under the provisions of section 405 (d) of the National Security Act, as amended."

Enactment of the quoted proviso would effectively eliminate the broad latitude and authority vested in the Secretary of Defense by section 405 of the National Security Act of 1947, as added by the National Security Act amendments of 1949, to establish working-capital funds. Its effect, therefore, would be to require the Department to secure specific congressional authorization through normal appropriation processes for the establishment and operation of each individual fund. In my letter of May 4, 1949, B-85820, to the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate, I endorsed the provisions of those amendments as constituting a framework for constructive efforts in the Department of Defense toward fundamental and urgently needed reforms in the budgeting and accounting structure of that Department. These reforms were in line with my general interest and objectives under the joint accounting improvement program in which I have been engaged with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget on a cooperative basis with all departments and agencies of the Government.

These objectives include the development of accounting and budgeting in the direction of reflecting a clear disclosure of the costs of goods and services actually used in connection with various functions and activities together with the amounts of resources acquired for future use (such as inventories). The acquisition and control of common items are extremely significant in the operations of the Department of Defense. No program for fundamental improvements in the management and control of these operations would be complete without achieving financial control and disclosure of the financial effect of acquisition and use of supplies, materials, equipment, and related items and of the investment of the Government in such items available for future use. Likewise, reforms were urgently needed in the underlying bases and methods for developing costs for the many manufacturing and other industrial activities of the Department in terms both of reflecting the investment in facilities devoted to such purposes as well as the costs of end products or services used in connection with various activities.

An important element in the National Security Act amendments for the achievement of these objectives was the provision made for the establishment of working-capital funds. The use of such funds was considered to be the best means available for accomplishing, as quickly as practicable, a

transition from a confused and obscure pattern of financing, budgeting, and accounting for manufacturing operations and the acquisition and use of inventories, to a fundamentally improved pattern which would adequately reflect the financial import of such operations and transactions. These funds provide the requisite means for bringing together all costs incident to inventories on hand and used, and of manufacturing and commercial type activities. The development and full disclosure of such facts, particularly with respect to resources available for future use, are essential to the determination of current cash appropriation needs. In line with this approach, the amendments required that these resources be charged to the applicable appropriations as used. This, in my opinion, provided a basis for more effective control and use of inventories as well as better accounting control and results with respect to the commercial and industrial operations carried on in the military departments. I will not undertake in this letter to deal more specifically with these advantages. They have been set forth in detail in Senate Report 366, Eighty-first Congress, of the Committee on Armed Services.

Worthy of special mention, however, is the fact that by recognizing the accumulation of resources in the form of common-use items in financial terms and charging them to appropriations as used, a basis is provided for a much more realistic appraisal of the results of operations and future financial requirements. Failure to reflect stocks on hand as resources in financial terms or as costs to current appropriations as used inevitably leads to undisclosed augmentation of current appropriations and diversion of funds in such appropriations to other purposes. Where appropriations are charged only for goods current acquired, there is insufficient pressure to avoid the dissipation of such stocks and the use of current appropriations for other purposes than originally planned. The so-called free-issue system previously in use, whereby materials acquired from prior-year appropriations are used without being charged to current-year appropriations, is, I believe, an open invitation to improvident use of stocks and current-year appropriations.

In endorsing the provisions of the National Security Act amendments for the installation of working-capital funds, I recognized that there were other means of getting at these deficiencies. Under the joint program we have utilized other means in various instances. However, the conditions and circumstances in the Department of Defense, with its highly diversified and complex financial operations, required the simplest possible and most direct means of coordinating appropriation charges with goods and services actually used and for bringing together costs of various industrial-type operations and the amount of inventories of various types as resources available for future use under various appropriations.

In endorsing the specific authorizations and related provisions for the establishment of these funds in the Department of Defense, I also recognized that a rather unusual amount of latitude and broad authority and flexibility was provided to the Secretary of Defense in implementing the provisions of the act. I called specific attention to this in my letter of May 4, 1949. While I would have preferred, as a matter of principle, for each working-capital fund to be specifically authorized by the Congress through the normal appropriation process, I felt the tremendous magnitude and complexity of the job to be done and the urgent need for accomplishing it as expeditiously as possible required a general authorization of this nature for a temporary period as the only practicable means of achieving the necessary transition

from the existing budgeting and accounting methods and classifications to the basis contemplated by the legislation.

Certain safeguards were provided by the legislation, including provisions for approval by the President of transfers of appropriation balances to the funds established; preparation and submission of financial and other reports to the Congress relating to working-capital-fund operations; and the provisions of sections 401 and 402 for a comptroller for the Department of Defense and the three military departments with centralized jurisdiction over various phases of financial management.

I emphasized in my letter that I considered it highly essential in view of the increased authority and responsibility over finances granted to the National Military Establishment that there be adequate provision for supervision and financial control of the type provided by the functions vested by the legislation in the comptrollers of the military departments. I also pointed out that the provisions of the act would require a broadened approach to audit through adaptation of methods and techniques to the accounting and internal control procedures developed in the National Military Establishment. These audit methods and techniques would necessarily include the reporting and full disclosure of the results of operation of the individual working capital funds, and contemplate such recommendations for improvement in the operations of the various funds as are considered desirable from a management or congressional control standpoint. I felt that the utilization of these measures would provide a further safeguard to the Congress and an informed basis upon which Congress might take action upon any weaknesses developed in the operation of the various working-capital funds. If the budget presentation and the accounting classifications are brought into a consistent relationship, a further and a more comprehensible basis of control over future operations is afforded the Congress.

Actual experience in working with the Department of Defense has shown the wisdom and intrinsic soundness of the National Security Act amendments of 1949. We have worked closely with the Department in the development of the implementing action, including the establishment of industrial and stock funds and the regulations and accounting procedures. I do not in any sense mean to imply that perfection has been achieved or that there are not certain deficiencies in connection with what has been accomplished to date. Certain temporary compromises and partial measures have had to be employed. I believe, however, that what has already been done is of tremendous significance in terms of the achievement of ultimate goals and that it has laid a sound foundation for accelerated progress in the future. Of particular significance are the industrial-fund regulations which were developed in the Office of the Defense Comptroller and promulgated by the Secretary of Defense. These regulations provide a sound framework for the development of vastly improved accounting and budgeting methods for manufacturing and industrial operations. Representatives of my office were in close touch with the development of these regulations. Various prototype installations of the revised systems of accounting have been authorized and started under provisions of these regulations. These are now in process of final development similar regulations governing the operations of stock funds which, I believe, will result in substantial improvements and elimination of some of the existing deficiencies in the operation of such funds.

The enactment of the House proviso would greatly retard progress under the program which has been going forward. While I am

not advised of the information on which the House based its action, other than as indicated in House Report 790, pages 15, 16, 44, the proviso appears to be sweeping with respect to the establishment of all forms of working-capital funds without specific congressional approval. It would thus negate the provisions of the National Security Act amendments which were considered to be necessary for a temporary period to provide for an orderly transition to the new methods of financial budgeting and accounting contemplated by that act.

In view of the intrinsic merit of the working-capital-fund concept, its demonstrated advantages in the majority of cases as a means of more businesslike management and better control of inventories, and the fact that the attainment of these objectives would be seriously impeded if the proviso in question were enacted, I feel that its enactment would not be in the best interest of the Government.

Sincerely yours,

LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE
UNITED STATES,
Washington, May 4, 1949.

HON. MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
*Chairman, Committee on Armed
Services, United States Senate.*

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Reference is made to your letter of April 27, 1949, acknowledged informally April 28, transmitting a copy of proposed amendments to S. 1269 and a detailed explanation and analysis of the provisions of the proposed amendments. A copy of the proposed amendments had been sent to Mr. Walter F. Frese, Chief of the Accounting Systems Division of my office, by the chief clerk of your committee on April 26, 1949, to expedite arrangements for a preliminary conference.

Since receipt of the proposed amendments in the General Accounting Office, several conferences have been held in which representatives of this Office participated with those of the National Military Establishment, the Treasury Department, and the Bureau of the Budget, and on Monday, May 2, with Mr. Eberstadt and staff of your committee. A good many changes have been tentatively adopted, and my comments will be directed in general to the draft dated April 30, 1949.

The limited time available has not permitted a detailed analysis of the many provisions of the amendment. However, the proposed provisions which add a new title IV to the National Security Act of 1947, dealing with the promotion of economy through establishment of uniform budgetary and fiscal procedures and organizations, are in general a substantial step in the right direction. The provisions of sections 401 and 402, providing for comptrollers for the National Military Establishment and for each of the three military departments, represent an especially important feature, considering the increased authority and responsibility over finances granted to the National Military Establishment by the remaining provisions of the amendments. It is understood that there has been some discussion over the exact form of the provisions with respect to the comptroller, but I wish to emphasize that it is important, in my opinion, that the legislation stress the functions to be performed by the comptroller. My views on this matter are set forth more fully in the attached copy of my letter of April 15, 1948, to the Administrator of the Economic Cooperation Administration.

The provisions of section 403 dealing with the setting up of a performance budget for

the National Military Establishment are forward-looking and hold great promise. They are in line with efforts of the Bureau of the Budget in which this Office has cooperated covering the Government generally. I am much interested in seeing accounting and budgeting for appropriations develop in the direction of reflecting a clear disclosure of the costs of goods and services actually used in connection with the performance of various functions together with the amounts of resources acquired which are available for future use (such as inventories). The proposed amendments should provide the foundation for constructive efforts in this direction in the National Military Establishment. The provisions of section 403 (b), authorizing transfers and adjustments within each military department for a limited period to expedite the conversion from present budget and accounting methods to the performance basis contemplated, are rather broad, but some such authority appears necessary in order to gain the desired objective.

Section 407 provides for the establishment, capitalizing, and use of working-capital funds in the National Military Establishment for the purpose of financing inventories for such stores, supplies, materials, and equipment, and providing working capital for such industrial-type activities, and for such commercial-type activities as provide common services within or among the departments and agencies of the establishment, as the Secretary of Defense may designate. The provisions of this section will enable more effective control of inventories in the National Military Establishment, more efficient use of supplies and equipment, and better accounting control and results with respect to commercial and industrial operations carried on in the military department. They are likewise a step in the right direction toward financial information showing the cost of operations.

These provisions will make possible substantial economies and increased efficiency under proper administration and can result in a net saving in the amount appropriated to the National Military Establishment through better use of existing stocks of supplies and materials. Of particular significance are the provisions of subsection (c), authorizing reimbursement from available appropriations for the cost of stores, supplies, materials, or equipment furnished and of services rendered or work performed, including administrative expenses; and those of subsection (f), providing that no greater cost shall be incurred by the requisitioning agency for stores, supplies, materials, or equipment drawn from inventories, and for services rendered or work performed by the industrial-type or commercial-type activities for which working-capital funds are authorized than the amount of appropriations or funds available for such purposes.

These provisions contemplate that the appropriation current when work is actually performed for or supplies are actually issued to an agency in the National Military Establishments will be charged with the cost of such work or supplies. The closer such costs can be related to the actual use of the materials by the requisitioning agency, the better results will be achieved in reflecting under the respective appropriations the actual results of operations for the fiscal year.

The provisions of subsection (d), authorizing the Secretary of Defense to provide capital for such working-capital funds by capitalizing inventories on hand, will further the desired objective. The additional provisions of that subsection, authorizing the Secretary of Defense, with the approval of the President, to provide capital by transfer until December 31, 1954, from unexpended balances of any appropriations of the mili-

tary departments not carried to the surplus fund of the Treasury, will have the effect of enabling the Secretary to use for setting up the working capital funds moneys which may originally have been appropriated by the Congress for other purposes.

A further effect of this authority would be to extend the availability of funds which otherwise would revert to the surplus fund of the Treasury. I feel that the attention of the committee should be called to these factors. However, the subsection provides a safeguard by prescribing that no deficiency shall be incurred as a result of any such transfer. This method will furnish a means of capitalizing the working-capital funds initially without additional appropriations by the Congress, and will contribute to a gradual building up of the working-capital funds during the transitional period.

The provisions of subsection (f) will act as a further safeguard by limiting the use of the stores in inventory under the working-capital funds or of services performed under such funds to those uses for which appropriations are made by the Congress. Thus, the main effect of the transfer provisions is to authorize a holding fund to be built up outside the normal appropriation process, under which stores can be accumulated subject to later authorized use. Also, the section requires that reports of the condition and operations of such funds shall be made annually to the President and to the Congress.

The provisions of subsection (h) of section 407, authorizing the appraised value of stores returned to working-capital funds to be charged to such funds and credited to the current appropriations concerned, would leave the door open to possible abuse through the issuance of supplies to appropriations near the close of one fiscal year and the return of such supplies to the working-capital fund in the following fiscal year, thus making additional funds available in the appropriations for the second fiscal year to the extent of the value of the supplies. However, it has been explained that some provision of this nature is necessary in order to persuade the various agencies in the Military Establishment to return to common stock, property not needed in their current operations, and make such property available for the most economic over-all use.

Section 408 provides for management funds in each of the three military departments for the purpose of facilitating economical and efficient conduct of operations financed by two or more appropriations where the costs of such operations are not susceptible of immediate distribution as charges to such appropriations. I wish to call attention to the provisions of subsection (b), which in the case of the Army management fund and the Air Force management fund would make available \$1,000,000 each from any unobligated balance of any appropriation available to the respective departments. My comments with respect to the transfer of unexpended balances under section 407 apply likewise to this subsection. Under proper circumstances, the use of the proposed management funds could assist in the efficient administration of activities carried on under more than one appropriation in the National Military Establishment and should lead to more adequate disclosure of the cost of such activities.

With the advent of a full performance budget based on functions and activities, the need for the use of management funds should diminish, but it is understood to be anticipated that such need would never entirely cease because of the unpredictable nature of some of the operations necessarily carried out. Other provisions of section 408 are aimed at preventing the use of the management funds for any obligation not prop-

erly chargeable to available funds under the National Military Establishment and the requiring at least once each fiscal year of a settlement on a cost basis with the respective appropriations involved.

Both sections 407 and 408 will broaden the audit responsibilities of the General Accounting Office in considerable measure and will require adaptation of audit methods and techniques to the accounting and internal control procedures developed in the National Military Establishment. However, there should be an ultimate opportunity, through increased effectiveness of internal controls and availability of reliable financial information, for a fuller and more adequate disclosure of the financial operations concerned.

I regard the provisions of section 413, as tentatively modified, as of the highest importance in placing the powers, duties, and responsibilities vested in the National Military Establishment by title IV within the Government's general budgetary, fiscal, and accounting framework. Those provisions, while repealing laws, orders, and regulations inconsistent with the provisions of the title IV, are intended to make it plain that the powers, duties, and responsibilities of the Secretary of Defense under the title are to be administered in conformance with the policy and requirements for administration of budgetary and fiscal matters in the Government generally, including accounting and financial reporting, and that nothing in the title will affect or disturb the authority in these matters of the Secretary of the Treasury, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, the Comptroller General, or any other Government official outside the National Military Establishment under existing law. I believe the National Military Establishment and others concerned are in complete agreement on this point, and I would recommend that the committee report in the bill, if the amendments should be adopted, include language to emphasize this intent.

We are continuing our discussions with the interested group on these amendments and will be glad to make any further suggestions which might contribute to the technical improvement of the language. I will be glad to have representatives of the Office appear before the committee, if you so desire, and answer any questions or present further information.

The whole program contemplated by the proposed amendments is of tremendous significance in relation to the joint accounting program now being carried on by the General Accounting Office, the Treasury Department, and the Bureau of the Budget in cooperation with all other Government agencies. If the amendments should be enacted, it will be our purpose to work in close collaboration with the National Military Establishment to the end that the accounting machinery developed may be responsive to internal management needs and requirements, and also consistent with principles and standards of accounting developed for the Government generally.

Sincerely yours,
LINDSAY C. WARREN,

Comptroller General of the United States.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The committee was unanimous in its belief that the provision was in the interest of economy and efficiency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 17, line 21.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in line 22, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out the colon and the following proviso: "Provided, That none of the funds appropriated in this or any other

act, and none of the property procured therewith, shall be available for transfer to any working capital fund under the provisions of section 405 (d) of the National Security Act, as amended."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Incidental Expenses of the Army," on page 18, line 22, after the word "sites", to strike out "\$187,914,000" and insert "\$194,514,000."

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, may this amendment go over until tomorrow?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CASE. The amendment proposes an increase of \$7,000,000. I believe some justification should be shown.

Mr. CAIN. I wonder whether it would be proper to ask the Senator from Wyoming to explain the use of the money intended in the proviso at the bottom of page 18. The Senator from South Dakota has asked that the amendment go over. Personally I would appreciate an explanation at this point, if there is to be a further consideration of the question tomorrow.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The amendment goes over. It will be explained tomorrow. I understood that a Senator asked that it go over.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] asked that the amendment go over. However, I thought perhaps the Senator from Wyoming would discuss the amendment at some reasonable length at the present time so that other Senators, who are not now present, could study his remarks in the RECORD tomorrow morning.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Mr. CAIN. The question revolves around what use is to be made of more than \$10,000,000 for public informational activities of the services.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. This is one of the substantial reductions which was made by the committee. The budget for 1952 called for the expenditure of \$15,622,903. The House, it will be noted, allowed \$12,300,000. The Senate committee has reduced the amount to the figure in the bill, so as to cut off informational activities in the field for the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, and the Department of the Air Force, which the committee felt might be excessive. In other words, we have gone below the estimates for 1951.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would like to call the attention of the Senator from Wyoming to the fact that the amendment which went over was the amendment on page 18, line 22, increasing the amount from \$187,914,000 to \$194,514,000. The Senator from Wyoming was referring to the second amendment on the same page, in the opinion of the Chair.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes. I understood the Senator from Washington to inquire about the proviso which is a limitation reducing the appropriation for informational services from fifteen-odd-million dollars to \$10,950,000.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator is quite correct, because as I understand the proviso, it relates to the use of some of the

moneys included in the amendment which the Senator from Wyoming asked to have go over until tomorrow.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is not that reduction in line with the approximately 30-percent reduction urged by the Senator from Michigan and the Senator from Virginia in relation to appropriations for public relations items?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct. The Senator from Virginia spoke to me about this matter, for it is in line with the action heretofore taken by the Senate to reduce unnecessary activities.

Mr. CAIN. When this amendment is discussed tomorrow, I wonder whether the Senator will provide us with information as to the total number of personnel required in connection with the use of the \$10,000,000. If that information is provided, I shall be very grateful.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Is it in connection with this fund that radio programs are put on for the entertainment of the armed services?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Whatever radio programs go out from Washington would not be interfered with by this item, which refers only to activities in the field.

Mr. AIKEN. This item would not relate to radio programs, would it?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is my understanding that the radio programs are carried on by means of the operations of the central office in Washington, and they are not affected by this item. This item relates to a cut in the funds for the radio services in the field.

Mr. AIKEN. I wonder whether the armed services are putting on too many radio programs. None of them seem to have any connection with military tactics. For instance, I have asked some persons—perhaps I have not asked the proper ones—just what was the object of the Army in sponsoring "The Shadow" program for some time, and what it had to do with the work of the armed services. I refer now to a mystery serial to which we used to listen on Sunday afternoons.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the radio-television branch of the public information service, operating from Washington, is designed to convey informative material to those who listen.

I am frank to say that I was not aware that the Army sponsored the radio program to which the Senator from Vermont has just referred. Is he altogether sure he is not referring to an announcement which was made in connection with such a program?

Mr. AIKEN. No, it was not merely an announcement. Much to my amazement, one day I started to listen to the mystery serial known as "The Shadow", and I found that the former sponsor of that program had given it up, and that the armed services had taken it over.

I have not listened lately to see whether that has continued. However, I could not fathom why the Army was sponsoring a program of that nature.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am frank to say that if that were so, I would be opposed to it. However, this is the first indication I have received of such an activity. The material now before us would indicate that the weekly radio program Time for Defense is carried by 215 ABC stations, and that program is not The Shadow.

The Air Force Hour, a weekly program, was developed; and it is being carried by approximately 400 Mutual network television stations.

There is a television Armed Forces Hour, presented on the Dumont chain, and approximately 56 stations are carrying it.

The Defense Report is another one.

Nowhere do I see any indication of a program similar to the one the Senator from Vermont has mentioned. Certainly I shall check on that matter, and I shall make certain about it.

Mr. AIKEN. There was one a few months ago; I heard it. However, I have not heard it recently, and have not tried to hear it. I do listen to and appreciate the programs—

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Did I correctly understand the Senator from Vermont to say that he likes "The Shadow"?

Mr. AIKEN. I like "The Shadow" better when it is not paid for by the taxpayers.

I have listened to and have enjoyed programs by the Marine Band, the Army Band, and other bands. However, some of the programs are getting a little out of the taxpayers' range.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If there are any such, we certainly will try to have them stopped.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator has indicated that the item of \$10,950,000 is for public relations in the field, I believe.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, no; it includes \$1,200,000 for the Office of Public Information, carried on in Washington under the leadership of Mr. Fritchle, a former editor of the Scripps-Howard chain.

Mr. FERGUSON. Then I misunderstood the Senator.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The reduction was made in the item for the field service.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the inquiry by the Senator from Washington has served a useful purpose, for if I correctly understood the statement of the Senator from Wyoming, the figure voted by the House of Representatives was \$12,300,000, in connection with the striking out of this proviso. Is that correct?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I would say to the Senator from South Dakota that the budget estimate was \$15,622,903. The amount voted by the House of Representatives was \$12,300,000. The committee was asked to increase the figure to \$14,422,000, but did not do so. Not only did the committee not vote to increase the figure, but the committee actually voted to decrease it to \$10,950,000.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I believe I have the floor. I wish to pursue this point a little further.

It now becomes clear that in reducing the appropriation for this activity from \$12,300,000, which the House intended to provide, the committee has provided \$1,250,000 more for other activities. The figures immediately preceding the proviso in lines 22 and 23 on their face provide for an increase of approximately \$6,600,000.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, yes.

Mr. CASE. So if we add the \$1,250,000 to that, there is an increase of \$8,350,000 at this particular point. In other words, the figure is larger than appears on the face of these items.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In the committee we voted to restore a number of budget estimates or parts of budget estimates.

The House voted a reduction below the amount of the budget estimate, which for this total item was \$198,914,000. The House voted to reduce that to \$187,914,000, or a reduction of \$11,000,000.

The testimony before the committee showed that the quartermaster and general depots, procurement offices, market centers, and inspection services needed additional personnel, and that the quartermaster supply in Army areas needed additional personnel, and that the quartermaster supply in overseas commands needed additional personnel, the total amounting to 1,592 man-years out of a total reduction of 5,550 man-years.

So we did not restore the complete cut made by the House of Representatives, but we restored only a part of it, in the amount of—

Mr. CASE. Eight million, three hundred and fifty thousand dollars.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No, \$6,600,000.

Mr. CASE. But, Mr. President, the point I make is that more than \$6,600,000 was restored. There was restored the difference between the amount which the House allowed for informational services and—

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is mistaken, because these informational activities are not to be confused with this appropriation. Appropriations for informational activities are scattered throughout the bill. Some are in the Army, some are in the Navy, and some are in the Air Force. This proviso is a restriction and a limitation, and it has nothing to do with the previous figure, unless the appropriation for the Army for informational service is included; and that has been severely cut.

Mr. CASE. But, Mr. President, that does not mitigate the fact that there is a restoration of \$1,250,000 for other activities scattered throughout the bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Not at all. There is not. The restoration is that of \$6,600,000, in this item, for incidental services of the Army, not for any other service.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, under the statement of the Senator from Wyoming, a limitation of \$10,950,000 has been placed upon the title in the bill for public information activities, for which the House appropriated \$12,300,000.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. CASE. That limitation necessarily means that \$1,250,000, carried in the bill, is available for other purposes. It may not be under this item of incidental expenses of the Army, although that is where the proviso is attached.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator has not understood the point which I am trying to make, with some difficulty, perhaps, that the House did not impose any limitation at all. This is a limitation made by the Senate committee, below the House figure.

Mr. CASE. Then I misunderstood what the Senator said. I understood the Senator a while ago to give us, first, the figure which the budget proposed and then the figure which the House proposed. If I am not authorized to take the figure which the House proposed as the amount allowed in the bill, then I beg the Senator's pardon. But I understood him to say that the item in the House bill was \$12,300,000.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think perhaps I did not state the matter with sufficient clarity to make myself understood. The point is that the Department of the Army wanted to have \$4,525,000 for informational service. The Navy wanted \$4,189,000, and the Department of the Air Force wanted \$5,705,000. We cut each of these to \$3,250,000, and then allowed the same amount which the House had allowed for the Office of Secretary of Defense.

Mr. CASE. I should like to ask the Senator one other question in regard to this proviso. The last of the provisions says: "including pay and allowances of military personnel assigned to such activities."

Ordinarily, of course, pay and allowances, or at least pay, come out of the fund for "pay of the Army." What the Senator has already said would indicate that possibly it was not intended that any part of the money under "incidental expenses of the Army" should be used for pay of personnel assigned to public informational activities. I should merely like to ask, as a direct question, whether that is a fact.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It was the desire of the committee, and it is so stated in the report, that military personnel should be assigned to other duties, and not go around taking photographs and pictures which add nothing to the military service.

Mr. CASE. But where will the money be charged? Will it be charged to the pay of the Army, and not to incidental expenses? We are here dealing, or at least this paragraph deals, with incidental expenses of the Army.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No; the appropriation for public informational service in this item for the Army is \$3,250,000, and we are asking that no sum above that amount may be used, including the pay and allowances of the military personnel, so that when the cut is made to \$3,250,000, it will not be possible to assign military personnel to carry on the work which we are trying to eliminate.

Mr. CASE. Will any part of the \$3,000,000 be used for pay of the personnel?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If they are military personnel doing this work, provided it did not bring the sum total above \$3,250,000, it would come out of the pay of the soldiers, assuredly.

Mr. FERGUSON rose.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I would like to nail that down. There is a heading in the bill, "Pay of the Army." Is it proposed to take personnel which is ordinarily paid out of the "Pay of the Army," and allow funds out of "Pay of the Army," and allow personnel which ordinarily would be paid out of that fund, to be transferred to some other agency or some other branch of the Defense Department, and then change their pay to the other heading, and still leave in the bill all the money for the "Pay of the Army" that would otherwise be included?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am trying to say as clearly as I can that the purpose of the amendment is to make certain that so far as the Army is concerned, not more than \$3,250,000, including pay of Army personnel and civilian personnel, may be expended; so that this effectively would require the transfer of military personnel.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. It may clarify the matter for the Senator from South Dakota to know that this proviso has nothing to do with the House figure of \$187,914,000.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. That figure has been increased to \$194,914,000.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. If a man is not allowed to work on this activity, and be paid out of this fund, he will be transferred to other activities; but he could not be paid, if he were performing informational activities, if the expenditures were to exceed \$10,950,000.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator has stated it correctly.

Mr. CASE. The Senator from South Dakota understands that perfectly well, but what fund will be charged with the pay of those people who are assigned to public informational activities?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. So long as the expenditure does not exceed \$3,250,000, military personnel, within that sum, may be paid out of the ordinary "Pay of the Army"; and that was true of the House language, too.

Mr. CASE. "May be" or "must be" paid?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. CASE. Does the Senator mean they "may be paid" or "will be paid"?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No, "may be," because there are more civilian personnel estimated for this work than military personnel.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, on page 10 of the bill, under the heading "Finance Corps," and under the subheading "Pay of the Army," it says:

For pay and allowances—

The amount stated is \$3,297,076,000, which includes the pay of military per-

sonnel. All I am trying to determine is whether the military personnel assigned to public informational activities is intended in some way, by the proviso on pages 18 and 19, to be paid out of some other fund than the regular pay of the Army.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No, it is not.

Mr. CASE. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment on page 18, line 22, is passed over. The clerk will read the next amendment.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Transportation Corps—Transportation Service, Army," on page 19, line 15, after the word "activities", to strike out "\$968,515,000" and insert "\$938,515,000", and in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, to insert "for expenditure during fiscal year 1952 and thereafter and \$30,000,000 for expenditure during fiscal year 1953 and thereafter for the purposes authorized in this paragraph."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, line 24, to strike out "\$1,213,707,000" and insert "\$817,931,000 for expenditure during fiscal year 1952 and thereafter and \$400,000,000 for expenditure during fiscal year 1953 and thereafter for the purposes authorized in this paragraph."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection—

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I note that in several places in the bill the committee has adopted the device of making available during the fiscal year 1952 and thereafter a certain sum, and making a further sum available for expenditure during the fiscal year 1953, and thereafter, for purposes authorized in the bill. In view of the fact that it occurs so frequently in the bill, I was wondering if at this point we might have a statement from the chairman of the committee. Was that in lieu of using contract authority and distributing the cash in a subsequent period, or what?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I may say to the Senator that I explained that at some length this morning. It will be found set forth on pages 1 and 2 of the report. The purpose was to point out the fact that there was a lag in the expenditure of military appropriations for procurement, measured by the length of time required to construct some of the implements and some of the vessels and aircraft which are being ordered, and in order to make it clear, first, that this appropriation will be expended during the period ending on the thirtieth of June 1952, or will necessarily have to be expended at some future time, and, second, that the revenues of the Government for this year will not have to be expended to make these payments, and, therefore, the appropriation does not constitute a deficit, it was deemed by the committee desirable to show what was planned to be expended during the fiscal year 1952 and what could not possibly be expended until the fiscal year 1953.

Mr. CASE. I may say to the Senator that it appears to me that it is a desirable alternative to the old idea of providing so much in cash and so much in contract authority. By this device it

will be much easier for the books to show the unobligated cash balance.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. We are going to carry that further.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Wyoming, earlier in the afternoon, was very helpful in broadening my own understanding of the section on the release of inactive and voluntary reservists, which section is covered on pages 6 and 7 of the committee report. I wonder if the Senator would permit me to ask him several additional questions on this subject at this point.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. CAIN. During the course of our colloquy this morning the Senator from Wyoming said he and his committee had reason to believe that the armed services had no intention of calling any more men involuntarily into service who had 12 months service during World War II. Does the word "men" cover both enlisted personnel and officers?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, yes.

Mr. CAIN. I raise the question because immediately following our colloquy I had reason to leave the floor, and a young naval officer told me he thought we had been talking exclusively about enlisted personnel.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. We were talking about officers and men.

Mr. CAIN. I wonder if the Senator from Wyoming would find it convenient to read to the Senate a paragraph or two of the testimony which led him and his committee to believe that the armed services have no further intention of calling up reservists who served 12 months in the last war?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I may not be able to find the exact language at this time, but I selected for the summary of testimony which was presented to the committee a letter from the Assistant Secretary, Mrs. Anna M. Rosenberg, from which I quote briefly:

When the Defense Department submitted its manpower program to the Congress in January, the requested period of service for Reserves was 27 months. This period was successively whittled to 24 months and then, in conference, to a maximum of 17 months for Inactive reservists with 12 months' World War II service. This meant an extensive revision of service plans but adjustments were made. One of the reasons why any lesser period was rejected was that the military departments had developed plans which called for earlier release for many categories of these Inactive reservists than the 17 months finally authorized. The plans were submitted to the Congress and they have been scrupulously followed.

Frankly, no further adjustments and acceleration are possible, consistent with the national security. The Departments are following an orderly and planned program for the release of reservists and are treating the above 17 months' period as a maximum rather than as a combined minimum and maximum. Many men are being released and, many are scheduled for release, considerably short of 17 months. However, setting the maximum period at any less than 17 months would deprive the Departments of sufficient flexibility to accomplish an orderly phase-out program and would seriously undermine our combat effectiveness, our state of readiness and our rotation program.

It would also bring forth a heavy call-up of additional inactive reservists and necessitate levies on National Guard units for individual replacements.

Furthermore, may I say that after the committee acted last Friday and inserted the language which the Senator from Washington has in mind, we were in contact with the Department of Defense, and expressed orally the view set forth in the report, and were given the assurance that there would probably be no difficulty in complying with the wishes of the committee.

Mr. CAIN. I am satisfied that the RECORD will benefit materially from what the Senator from Wyoming has just read. The question is uppermost in the minds of thousands of young Americans, and the more solid information we can get into the RECORD I think the more easily those who are not members of this body can understand the matter.

I want to say to the Senator from Wyoming that I have in mind another question, which, to me, is of real importance and interest to every Member of this body. If it is the intention, of the armed services, as I believe it to be from what the Senator has just said, not to call up any additional inactive or voluntary reservists who have served 12 months in World War II, why are the armed services presently processing such categories of individuals into the armed services?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I assume that may have started before the committee acted last Friday, and I assume we must allow a little time for adjustment.

Mr. CAIN. What I am getting at is this question: If I correctly understand the situation, if the armed services have thoroughly studied the question of what to do with reservists, and have decided that for any of a number of reasons they will not call up additional reservists, would it not be in keeping with that policy, and administratively very easy, to cancel the notices to report for duty at some future date, which notices have now been in the mails, to my knowledge, for the past several weeks?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course, that would be quite possible, but I have no knowledge of the individual cases and the conditions which would be affected. I felt that since the Armed Services Committee of the House, and, I think, the Armed Services Committee of the Senate, were studying this matter, and since it necessarily involves a legislative amendment to an existing statute, which is not proper upon an appropriation bill, I would not go into that matter.

Mr. CAIN. I press this point only because of the reasonableness of the position which has been taken by the Appropriations Committee, and which position, presumably, has been agreed to by the military authorities. That brings me to something which I think ought to be characterized as being common logic: If it is not intended to take any additional reservists into the service at this time for the Korean War, and it is the purpose to get those reservists who are now serving there out of the service, why should the arrangements now pending to bring in probably some thousands of additional reservists be completed?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course, the Senator will recall that the amendment which was inserted by the House provided only for discharge after 12 months. It did not provide that no reservists should be called.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Washington is thoroughly conscious of that.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In order to carry forward the rotation program, which contemplates bringing 100,000 men back by December, it may be essential for the national security, to draw upon some of the other men.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Washington has been addressing himself not to the House amendment, which was deleted, but to the language provided by the Senate Appropriations Committee, which on its face seems not only very reasonable, but very workable likewise. Perhaps between now and tomorrow, when the question will be further under consideration, the Senator or his staff might inquire of the armed services in general as to whether in keeping with this, what looks like a new policy, they are giving consideration to canceling the orders which in some respects are a contradiction of what the Senator is proposing to us as coming from the committee.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should be very happy to make inquiry about the matter.

Mr. CAIN. I will be very grateful, sir.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, of course, one would not have a right to expect more than a speculative answer, but surely my friend from Wyoming does not anticipate that, as a practical matter, there will be legislation at this session of Congress with respect to the involuntary and negative reserves, does he?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. As a practical matter I would think it was doubtful. But I know that the House Committee on Armed Services has been giving extensive study to this matter. In fact I have here a copy of a progress report which has been issued by the House committee. It is entitled "Recall and Release of Reservists. First Interim Report of Special Subcommittee on Civilian Components of the Armed Services Committee, House of Representatives, July 13, 1951."

It is altogether possible that the House, in taking up this work, may act upon this question. But I quite agree with the Senator that if Congress adjourns by the 15th of October maybe there will not be time to deal with a matter of that kind.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I apprehend from the discussion that took place on the floor of the House that it is not very likely that there will be substantial legislation on that subject at this session. That is one reason why I think there is some special point in the Van Zandt amendment which was inserted on the House floor. Unless the military authorities make a very persuasive case, I think reservists are entitled to some comfort and some assurance. At the present time their dependents are fairly inundating every Senatorial office, as the Senator knows, with complaints. One case came to my attention today of a man with 51 months of service, and yet evidently there is no

relief for him. I believe that somewhere along the line, even if it comes as a modified rider on an appropriation bill, some of these men who have been in the service for a long time, some of whom are rather elderly, are entitled to some assurance from this body before the first session of the Eighty-second Congress adjourns.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have sought to give every assurance that has come to our committee. I feel certain that is the plan of the Department of Defense to provide for a release. The system of rotation was begun within 2 months after Korea first started, as I recall, and it has been stepped up, progressing month to month, increasing month to month. It is all in harmony with this general program. General McAuliffe, head of the personnel for the Army—General McAuliffe, whose fame was made permanent, I would think, at Bastogne in World War II—and the Secretaries of Defense, gave a clear indication to the committee of their complete understanding of the difficulties of this question and their desire to remedy the situation, if they could do it without impairing the national security.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I assume, then, from the action taken by the committee that it would resist, of course, even any modification of the amendment that was inserted on the House floor, if it were offered.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If anything were to be done, if any new evidence to be, I presented, I would prefer having it worked out in conference, speaking for myself.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL subsequently said: Mr. President, a moment ago I did not have before me a matter which I wished to bring to the attention of the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that the remarks I am about to make, together with the letter to which I shall refer, appear in the RECORD at the conclusion of the colloquy between the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] because it is pertinent to the Reserve question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. I bring to the attention of the Senate a letter received this morning on the Reserve question, a situation which I personally think has been badly handled as we look at the over-all picture during the last year or more.

Repeatedly representatives of the Military Establishment have appeared before the appropriate committees of Congress, promising to give some type of fair consideration to these men in the Reserves, the majority of whom have given long service before this Nation was launched into the Korean affair.

Only very recently have we been informed, and press reports have indicated, that the tenure in service of the Reserves is to be automatically extended in the Military Establishment for a longer period of time than the House committee had decided upon. Naturally I do not have all the facts, but I feel that the plight of these men should be brought to

the attention not only of the Senate but to the attention of the country at the proper time.

I want to take this opportunity to read into the RECORD a letter which I have received which seems to indicate the feeling of thousands and thousands of these men who have previously served our country, and are presently serving it, but who do not like, much less understand, some of the maneuverings they have been subjected to. I personally feel that the Reserves should be given a break, and we might as well make up our minds that we must face this situation in order to do justice by these men if we expect to have their confidence and respect and that of their families who have been so inadequately dealt with.

The following letter is addressed to me as a Senator from Kansas. I shall not name the writer, for obvious reasons. If necessary I shall be glad to disclose his name, but I prefer not to have his name disclosed. The letter reads as follows:

SEPTEMBER 7, 1951.

Hon. ANDREW F. SCHOEPEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

I would like to relate a sob story which I think is true for many others besides myself.

I am now 30 years of age and at the age of 25 I signed a paper enlisting in the Air Force Reserve. This enlistment was for 5 years and expired last December. As I understand it, this is a contract to the Government to allow one's self to be recalled to service in case of emergency. I knew that when I signed, but I did not know that the Government could extend this contract without my permission. However, as you know, it is now impossible for me to resign from the Reserves, even though I desire to.

I am not trying to renege on my responsibilities to my country, and if the time comes that I am needed to fight for the United States, I will do so willingly, not because I am forced to do so through a contract which was not kept by the second party. In fact, I am more likely to fight for a government whose word I respect, rather than one who forces me to and in the same breath cries that it is the advocate of freedom. Shall those of us who volunteered for a hitch in the Reserve take a load while others take the cream of the civil jobs? If you think I have a persecution complex, try and get a job or try and find a wife if they know you are a Reserve.

My beef is this: The Government has not kept its part of the bargain. I agree that a Reserve is needed, but is a man bound to remain in it for a lifetime because he signed at an early age? Is a man who wants to marry and raise children for his country to be penalized for his patriotism and made to feel that he is always in the position of having to take the load of defense even though he has previously served the best years of his life?

I spent 2 year overseas and 2 years in the zone of the interior, and I honestly feel I am entitled to at least have a try at marriage, security and happiness without fear of being uprooted by a contract I made that has expired.

It is my belief that in case of emergency there will always be enough men who will voluntarily belong to the Reserve and who in case of emergency will rise like the minute men of Lexington and Concord to defend what they believe in. How about giving us a chance to be citizens and not soldiers all our life, if we so choose? What I mean is this, let us contract our services to the Govern-

ment and be assured that the contract will be kept by both parties. I mean just this, I want Congress to remove such autocratic and tyrannical moves as forcibly extending enlistment times. I have never broken a contract with anyone yet and I will not do so with the United States. How about an even break?

Sincerely,

I think that letter would appropriately follow the colloquy to which I have referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the pending amendment, on page 21, line 24, under the subhead "Signal Corps—Signal service of the Army," after the word "thereof," to strike out "\$1,213,707,000" and insert "\$817,931,000", and line 25, to insert "for expenditure during fiscal year 1952 and thereafter and \$400,000,000 for expenditure during fiscal year 1953 and thereafter for the purposes authorized in this paragraph," is agreed to.

The next amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Medical service—Medical and Hospital Department," on page 24, line 14, after the word "institutions", to strike out "\$269,580,000" and insert "\$259,580,000", and in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, to insert "for expenditure during fiscal year 1952 and thereafter \$10,000,000 for expenditure during fiscal year 1953 and thereafter for the purposes authorized in this paragraph."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Corps of Engineers—Engineer service, Army," on page 25, line 19, after the word "for", to strike out "\$1,166,049,000" and insert "\$1,126,049,000", and in line 20, after the amendment just above stated, to insert "for expenditure during fiscal year 1952 and thereafter and \$40,000,000 for expenditure during fiscal year 1953 and thereafter for the purposes authorized in this paragraph."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Ordnance Corps—Ordnance service and supplies, Army," on page 26, line 25, after the word "Office", to strike out "\$8,307,500,000" and insert "\$3,332,082,430", and in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, to insert "for expenditure during fiscal year 1952 and thereafter and \$4,743,974,000 for expenditure during fiscal 1953 and thereafter for the purposes authorized in this paragraph."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to correct a typographical error. On page 27, line 2, of this amendment, I propose to insert the word "year" after the word "fiscal."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment to the committee amendment is agreed to, and without objection, the amendment, as amended, is agreed to.

The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Chemical Corps—Chemical service, Army," on page 28, line 3, after the word "ranges", to strike out "\$122,560,000" and insert "\$102,560,000", and in line 4, after the amendment just above stated, to insert "for expenditure

during fiscal year 1952 and thereafter and \$20,000,000 for expenditure during fiscal year 1953 and thereafter for the purposes authorized in this paragraph."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Departmental salaries and expenses—Salaries, Department of the Army," on page 34, line 11, after the word "services", to strike out "\$3,625,000" and insert "\$3,723,400."

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, may that amendment go over?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I suggest that all the amendments on pages 34 and 35 go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments on those two pages will go over.

The next amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of the Navy—Title IV—Construction of aircraft and related procurement," on page 39, line 10, after the word "expended", to strike out "\$4,000,000,000" and insert "\$1,050,000,000"; in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, to insert "for expenditure during fiscal year 1952 and thereafter and \$2,950,000,000 for expenditure during fiscal year 1953 and thereafter for the purposes authorized in this paragraph", and in line 14, after the figures "\$450,000,000" to insert "of the \$1,050,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Shipbuilding and conversion," on page 40, line 19, after the word "appropriation", to strike out "\$1,343,297,000" and insert "\$245,040,000", and in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, to insert "for expenditure during fiscal year 1952 and thereafter and \$1,098,257,000 for expenditure during fiscal year 1953 and thereafter for the purposes authorized in this paragraph."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Ordnance for shipbuilding and conversion," on page 42, line 5, after the word "appropriation", to strike out "\$431,390,000" and insert "\$75,000,000" and in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, to insert "for expenditure during fiscal year 1952 and thereafter and \$356,390,000 for expenditure during fiscal year 1953 and thereafter for the purposes authorized in this paragraph."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Public works," on page 43, line 19, after the word "expended", to strike out "\$50,414,000" and insert "\$51,657,000", and in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, to insert "of which \$1,243,000 shall be used for construction, installation, or repair of sewage facilities at the naval base, Newport, R. I., and the remainder shall be available."

Mr. CASE. May that amendment go over?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be passed over.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I am not going to take up the time of the Senate at this late hour to state all the argu-

ments in favor of this particular amendments in the bill; but realizing that the nature of the unanimous-consent agreement is such that any amendment which is objected to today, whether or not it is agreed to, on the suggestion of one Member will be a new matter tomorrow, I should like to insert in the RECORD for the benefit of the Members of the Senate a short statement I have prepared pointing up the need of this particular item, and also an editorial which appeared in the Providence Journal published in the city of Providence, R. I., on the 2d day of September, 1951. I ask unanimous consent at this time that they may be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, Mr. PASTORE's statement and the editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR PASTORE

I should like to take this opportunity to express my feelings on this appropriation for \$1,243,000 to be used for the construction, installation, or repair of sewage facilities at the naval base at Newport, R. I.

During my term as governor of the State of Rhode Island, I became increasingly aware of the seriousness of the water-pollution problem. Action was taken, under my direction, to rid the waters of Rhode Island of the causes of this pollution which could result only in sickness, disease, and the destruction of the natural resources for which this State was so well known. The cooperation which I received from the various communities was indeed very gratifying.

Tremendous strides have been taken and are still progressing toward making the waters of Narragansett Bay healthy and clean. However, and it grieves me to say this, the obstacle on the road to success, is the failure of the United States Navy to adequately provide for sewage facilities at the naval base in Newport, R. I. This appropriation will enable the Navy to do its part, and I know that the Navy is just as anxious to cooperate as the people of Rhode Island are to have it cooperate.

Millions of gallons of raw sewage are being deposited daily into Rhode Island waters by naval units in the Newport area. Now when we are increasing our Armed Forces in the struggle for world peace the increase in naval personnel is certain to aggravate an already over-aggravated situation.

The city of Newport has completed plans and specifications for carrying out a \$2,250,000 sewage disposal program. This program requires the closest coordination between the Navy and the city of Newport. But, before this coordination is possible, the Navy must have this appropriation.

The antipollution law of the State of Rhode Island provides that the State department of health may require a person (includes cities, towns, corporations, etc.) to adopt a system or means to prevent pollution when said person discharges sewage in amounts which cause damage or are likely to cause "damage to the public, or to any person having a right to use said waters for boating, fishing or other purposes, or owning property in, under or bordering upon same." This is the law of the State of Rhode Island. Frankly, I believe that if the offender, which in this instance is the United States Navy, were a private concern, legal action would have been taken long ago.

I would like to quote an excerpt from a letter which I have received from Edward A. McLaughlin, M. D., director of health, State of Rhode Island, concerning the pollution problem in Newport: "The discharge of raw sewage by the city of Newport and by the Navy has made it necessary that the department of health declare Newport Harbor unfit

for bathing or the taking of shellfish. Miles of shoreline north of Newport Harbor on the west side of the island of Rhode Island, including Coddington Cove have likewise been declared unfit for bathing or the taking of shellfish because of the discharge of raw sewage by the Navy. Actually dozens of Navy outlets discharging raw sewage rim the area. The wide dispersion of the outlets alone accounts in large measure for the extensive areas made unfit for bathing or taking of shellfish."

To my way of thinking Congress has a moral obligation to assist the people of Rhode Island in their laudable efforts to rid the waters of the State of disease-ridden, germ-infested waters. This moral obligation can be fulfilled by supporting the appropriation which is now before the Senate. It would truly be a discouraging feeling for the taxpayers of Rhode Island to have seen their hard-earned money used to clean up the waters of Narragansett Bay only to find that their Congress refused to cooperate by denying a comparatively small appropriation. I am sure that no Member of this great body would want to face the responsibility for having refused to sanction such a worthy project.

As a further note I would like to add that the engineering firm of Metcalf & Eddy, of Boston, Mass., conducted a thorough investigation of the need for adequate sewage-disposal facilities in the Newport area and their report indeed confirms the vital need for such facilities. I am a firm believer in economy and I realize that this is not the time for normal peacetime projects but, lest there be any question, this is not a project which should wait. Newport is a Navy town and always has been. Without a shadow of a doubt it will be home to many families from other States, and we in Rhode Island want to make Newport a place upon which Navy men, wives and children can always reflect with pleasant thoughts. A clean, healthy area is in sight, and I cannot urge too strongly that this Congress do its part to further this worthy project of preserving and maintaining our natural resources and protecting the health of our citizens.

PROPER QUESTION

The Senate Appropriations Subcommittee, considering the request of Senators GREEN and PASTORE for funds for construction by the Defense Department of sewage treatment facilities to stop the pollution of Narragansett Bay by the Navy's numerous shore installations in the Newport area, wants to know what Rhode Island itself has done to combat bay pollution.

It is a perfectly proper question. And the answer to it, easily documented from the record, is overwhelmingly convincing.

In March 1947 at the urging of Mr. PASTORE, who was then Governor, the Rhode Island general assembly enacted a series of laws designed to end the pollution of public waters in the State by requiring treatment and purification before discharge into those waters of any effluent containing sewage or other obnoxious wastes.

Thereupon, the State itself and its local communities initiated an extensive and costly program for the collection and proper treatment of literally scores of millions of gallons of sewage that was then being discharged daily, either raw or with insufficient purification, in Narragansett Bay and its tributary rivers.

Here is the record of expenditures for sewer purposes that have been authorized by the legislature since that time:

By the Blackstone Valley Sewer Commission (for the cities of Pawtucket and Central Falls and portions of three towns), \$7,500,000; town of East Providence, \$5,630,750; city of Cranston (in addition to \$5,000,000 previously spent), \$2,600,000; Newport, \$2,-

000,000; Providence, \$1,478,260; Bristol, \$750,000; Pawtucket, \$600,000; Warren, \$325,000; Jamestown, \$300,000; State institutions, \$225,000; North Providence, \$175,000.

The aggregate of these expenditures, all authorized within a period of less than 5 years, is \$21,584,000. Not all of the money has as yet actually been spent, but some 75 percent of it has been, and the rest is definitely committed. Newport, for example, which has been holding up its program in the hope of meshing it in with that of the Navy, has now become tired of waiting and is going ahead independently.

Every dollar of this huge sum will help, directly or indirectly, to clean up Narragansett Bay and to keep it clean permanently, by providing the facilities necessary to gather and treat wastes that now or in the future may enter it or its tributary waters.

What—and all—the State and its cities and towns are asking of Congress is that it cooperate with them by taking similar steps to stop the pollution of the bay that results from the dumping of raw sewage from the Navy's establishments along its shores. Abatement of pollution caused by Federal agencies is a strictly Federal responsibility, which in this instance has been evaded all too long.

The cost of correcting the situation, according to the Navy, would be \$1,243,000. The request of our Senators that the money be provided at once is entirely reasonable and logical in view of the great effort that Rhode Island itself is making and of the immensely larger sums of its own money that it is spending.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I will only say for the purpose of the RECORD that I am gratified the committee saw fit to insert this particular amendment in the bill as it was reported. I am particularly grateful to the Senator from Wyoming. The senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] and I at the time the fourth supplemental bill came up for consideration suggested this particular item in the form of an amendment.

At that time it was not agreed to by the Members of the Senate. The strongest argument against it at the time was that it should come up in the regular appropriation bill. This is the regular appropriation bill.

Only yesterday I visited the naval installation at Newport, and I asked Admiral Olson just how many men were housed there. I was told that there were 8,000. I want Members of the Senate to realize that raw sewage from that installation, where 8,000 people live, is being dumped into Narragansett Bay. We in the State of Rhode Island have spent millions of dollars to clean up the situation. We cannot do it effectively or adequately unless the Navy does its job too. I believe that an authorization for this item was passed during the last session of Congress. There is a strong moral obligation on the part of the Congress to do its part, and I sincerely hope that Members of the Senate will agree to this particular item.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of the Air Force—Title V—Aircraft and related procurement," on page 47, line 8, after the word "expended", to strike out "\$11,215,800,000" and insert "\$3,215,800,000"; in line 9, after the amendment just above

stated, to insert "for expenditure during fiscal year 1952 and thereafter and \$8,000,000,000 for expenditure during fiscal year 1953 and thereafter for the purposes authorized in this paragraph", and in line 12, after the figures "\$625,000,000", to insert "of the \$3,215,800,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Major procurement other than aircraft," on page 47, line 25, after the word "vehicles", to strike out "\$1,750,000,000" and insert "\$1,000,000,000", and on page 48, at the beginning of line 1, to insert "for expenditure during fiscal year 1952 and thereafter and \$800,000,000 for expenditure during fiscal year 1953 and thereafter for the purposes authorized in this paragraph."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Acquisition and Construction of Real Property," on page 48, after line 5, to strike out:

For an additional amount for "Acquisition and construction of real property," to remain available until expended, \$85,000,000, for payment of obligations incurred under authority heretofore granted under this head to enter into contracts.

And in lieu thereof to insert the following:

For the continuation of the construction of four classified projects authorized by Public Law 910, Eighty-first Congress, approved January 6, 1951, and Public Law 43, Eighty-second Congress, approved May 31, 1951, to remain available until expended, \$187,300,000 of which \$85,000,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority heretofore granted under this heading to enter into contracts.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Research and development," on page 52, line 12, after the word "expended", to strike out "\$425,000,000" and insert "\$225,000,000", and in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, to insert "for expenditure during the fiscal year 1952 and thereafter and \$200,000,000 for expenditure during fiscal year 1953 and thereafter for the purposes authorized in this paragraph."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Reserve personnel requirements," on page 52, line 21, after the word "instruction", to insert "or on duty under section 5, National Defense Act, as authorized by law."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 52, line 25, after the word "law", to strike out "\$17,543,000" and insert "\$19,843,000."

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, may the amendment on page 52, line 25, extending over into line 1 on the following page, be passed over until tomorrow?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be passed over.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I share the wish to the Senator from South Dakota that this amendment be passed over until tomorrow. I do so in the hope that the committee may find it convenient to provide us with additional information tomorrow concerning the attitude

of the armed services as it relates to the possibility of canceling the volunteer and inactive reservist orders which are outstanding with respect to young men who have been advised of a date on which they are to report, but who have not yet been called into the Federal service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title VI—General provisions," on page 55, after line 16, to strike out:

(b) No part of any appropriation contained in this act for "Pay and allowances" of military personnel shall be expended for the pay or allowances, accruing after November 30, 1951, of any member of the inactive or volunteer reserve who served on active duty for a period of 12 months or more in any branch of the Armed Forces during the period beginning December 7, 1941, and ending September 2, 1945, if such member shall have served on active duty for a period of 12 months or more after June 26, 1950, unless such member shall have voluntarily consented to remain on active duty.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I suggest that inasmuch as this is a controversial amendment, it should be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be passed over.

The next amendment was, on page 57, line 22, after the word "tuition", to insert "specifically approved by the Secretary of the department concerned and."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, let this amendment be passed over. An amendment is to be offered in connection with it.

Mr. CASE. Which amendment is that?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the amendment on page 57, line 22. Without objection, the amendment will be passed over.

The next amendment was, on page 67, after line 2, to strike out:

SEC. 628. No appropriation contained in this act shall be available for any direct expense (including commercial transportation in the United States to the place of sale but excluding all transportation outside the United States) in connection with the maintenance, conduct, operation, or management of sales commissaries, or commissary stores, of agencies of the Department of Defense, except where reimbursement for such expenses is to be made to the appropriations concerned from the proceeds of sales therein.

And in lieu thereof to insert the following:

SEC. 628. No appropriation contained in this act shall be available on and after January 1, 1952, in connection with the operation of commissary stores of the agencies of the Department of Defense for the cost of purchase and maintenance of operating equipment and supplies and for the actual or estimated cost of utilities as may be furnished by the Government and of shrinkage, spoilage, and pilferage of merchandise under the control of such commissary stores, except as authorized under regulations promulgated by the Secretaries of the military departments concerned, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense, which regulations shall provide for reimbursement therefor to the appropriations concerned and, notwithstanding any other provision of law, shall provide for the adjustment of the sales

prices in such commissary stores to the extent necessary to furnish sufficient gross revenue from sales of commissary stores to make such reimbursement: *Provided, however*, That under such regulations as may be issued pursuant to this section all utilities may be furnished without cost to the commissary stores outside the continental United States and in Alaska.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I should like to ask one question with regard to this amendment. As I read it, the purpose is to modify the commissary rule adopted by the House.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct. In effect, this amendments adopts the naval regulation with respect to mark-up, which amounts to about 6 percent.

Mr. CASE. I have no objection to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 67, after line 2.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 69, after line 13, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 630. In order more effectively to administer the programs and functions of the Department of Defense, the President, to the extent he deems it necessary and appropriate in the interest of national defense, may authorize within the Office of the Secretary of Defense 15 temporary positions to be placed in grades GS-17 and GS-18 of the general schedule of the Classification Act of 1949 in accordance with the procedures and standards of that act. Not more than eight of these positions shall be in grade GS-18. Such positions shall be additional to the number authorized by section 505 of that act.

Mr. CASE. I ask that the amendment go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will go over.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 70, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 631. No part of any money appropriated in titles II, III, IV, or V of this act shall be expended under any contract (other than a contract for personal services) entered into after the enactment of this act unless such contract provides—

(1) that the Government may, by written notice to the contractor, terminate the right of such contractor to proceed under such contract if it is found, after notice and hearing, by the Secretary of the military department with which the contract is made, or his designee, that gratuities (in the form of entertainment, gifts, or otherwise) were offered by such contractor, or any agent or representative of such contractor, to any officer or employee of the Government with a view toward securing a contract or securing favorable treatment with respect to the awarding or amending, or the making of any determinations with respect to the performing, of such contract: *Provided*, That the existence of the facts upon which such Secretary makes such findings shall be in issue and may be reviewed in any competent court;

(2) that in the event any such contract is so terminated the Government shall be entitled, (A) to pursue the same remedies against the contractor as it could pursue in the event of a breach of the contract by the contractor, and (B) as a penalty in addition to any other damages to which it may be entitled by law, to exemplary damages in an amount not less than 3 nor more than 10 times (as determined by the Secretary or

his designee) the costs incurred by any such contractor in providing any such gratuities to any such officer or employee.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] came to me earlier in the day and asked that the amendment be amended in line 12, after the word "offered" to insert the words "or paid." I offer the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am informed that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], after further study, thought the amendment to the amendment should be, after the word "offered" to insert "or given," rather than "or paid." I do not know anything about the merits of the proposed amendment, but I make that suggestion to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; I believe the Senator is correct. I move that the committee amendment on page 70, line 12, be amended to insert "or given" after the word "offered."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 71, after line 6, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 632. No funds appropriated in titles II, III, IV, and V of this act shall be used for the payment in excess of 530,000 full-time graded civilian employees at any one time during the current fiscal year.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I suggest that the amendment go over until tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be passed over until tomorrow.

The next amendment was, on page 71, line 11, to change the section number from "630" to "633."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the committee amendments.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It completes the committee amendments, save those which have gone over by unanimous consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I hope that at the session tomorrow we will proceed to the consideration of the amendments which have gone over.

Mr. McFARLAND. I hope that tomorrow we can dispose of the bill. It had been my intention, if we had made sufficient progress, to take up S. 355, the postal pay bill, and S. 622, the classified employees pay bill. I mention the bills because I want Senators to be in readiness to consider them. I certainly hope we will at least be able to complete consideration of the pending bill tomorrow.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is it the Senator's intention to complete consideration of the military appropriation bill, tomorrow, if possible, and then take up the

two remaining pay bills immediately after the pending bill is disposed of, whenever that may be?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes, unless something should develop which would force us to change our schedule. If consideration of the pending bill takes longer than is anticipated, we may have to change our plans. Certainly I hope that we will dispose of the pending bill tomorrow.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes.

Mr. CAIN. I have a question which I think is of concern not only to the Senator from Washington, but to other Senators. I am conscious of the fact that \$61,000,000,000 are involved in the pending bill. Does the majority leader intend to have the bill passed tomorrow by voice vote, or are we to have the opportunity to have a record vote and give evidence of the fact that a majority of the Senators in the Senate really know what they are doing at the time they do it?

Mr. McFARLAND. I certainly hope, indeed, and I am sure, that the Senate will know what is being done, regardless of how the bill is passed. I am just one of 96 Senators, and I shall naturally abide by the wishes of the majority.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Arizona will not begrudge me the thought that the legitimacy of my remark stems from the number of Senators who are now on the floor. Were it not for the fact that a handful of amendments have gone over until tomorrow, the chances are that the Senators now on the floor would have passed the bill this afternoon.

RECESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, September 11, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate September 10 (legislative day of September 4) 1951:

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

George L. Robertson, of Missouri, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Missouri, vice Drake Watson, term expired.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

Walter E. Huntley, of Alaska, to be United States marshal for division No. 3, district of Alaska, vice Paul C. Herring, deceased.

Leo H. Brooker, of Florida, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Florida, vice Chester S. Dishong, term expired.

IN THE AIR FORCE

Lt. Gen. Richard Emmel Nugent, 57A, Deputy Chief of Staff, Personnel, United States Air Force (major general, U. S. Air Force) to be placed on the retired list in the grade of lieutenant general under the provisions of subsection 504 (d) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

The following-named officers for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grades indicated, under the provisions of title V of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947,

with dates of rank to be established under the provisions of the afore-mentioned title:

To be major general

Maj. Gen. Bryant LeMaire Boatner, 362A (brigadier general, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Robert Wilkins Douglass, Jr., 46A (brigadier general, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. James Somers Stowell, 72A (brigadier general, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Glenn Oscar Barcus, 87A (brigadier general, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Lt. Gen. Elwood Richards Quesada, 50A (brigadier general, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. James Wrathall Spry, 82A (brigadier general, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Patrick Weston Timberlake, 83A (brigadier general, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Joseph Smith, 84A (brigadier general, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Francis LeRoy Ankenbrandt, 267A (brigadier general, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Morris Robert Nelson, 277A (brigadier general, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Kenneth Perry McNaughton, 278A (brigadier general, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Clarence Shortridge Irvine, 296A (brigadier general, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Emmett O'Donnell, Jr., 387A (brigadier general, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Thomas Sarsfield Power, 481A (brigadier general, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

To be brigadier general

Maj. Gen. Harry George Armstrong, 209A (colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States, medical.

Brig. Gen. John Ferral McBlain, 203A (colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Brig. Gen. James Elbert Briggs, 356A (colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Norris Brown Harbold, 369A (colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Albert Boyd, 424A (colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Julius Kahn Lacey, 538A (colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Carl Amandus Brandt, 563A (colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Kenneth Eugene Webber, 117A (colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. John Halliday McCormick, 253A (colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Manuel Jose Asensio, 324A (colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Alfred Rockwood Maxwell, 359A (colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Robert Frederick Tate, 363A (colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. John Alexander Samford, 377A (colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Brig. Gen. George Ferrow Smith, 380A (colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Delmar Taft Spivey, 385A (colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Robert Kinder Taylor, 390A (colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Kingston Eric Tibbetts, 436A (colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Frederick Rodgers Dent, Jr., 444A (colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Reuben Columbus Hood, Jr., 498A (colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Brig. Gen. John Kenton Gerhart, 525A (colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Ralph Powell Swofford, Jr., 547A (colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Robert Merrill Lee, 590A (colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Dean Coldwell Strother, 591A (colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

The following-named officers for promotion in the United States Air Force, under the provisions of sections 502, 508, and 509 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 and section 306 of the Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law.

To be majors

CHAPLAINS

Duhan, Henry, 18782A.
McCandless, Paul Clyde, 18780A.
Partin, Delbert Carson, 18781A.

To be captains

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

Adams, John Alfred, 16445A.
Aldrich, Thomas Albert, 16418A.
Allen, Charles Stewart, 16305A.
Anania, August Robert, 16352A.
Argersinger, James Bernard, 16404A.
Armstrong, William Price, 16471A.
Augsburger, Elias Ray, 16329A.
Avance, Donald Elmar, 16441A.
Baker, John Clark, 16357A.
Banfill, Margaret Marion, 21400W.
Barber, Edwin Forrest, 16338A.
Barnes, Roy Arthur, 16423A.
Belton, William Owen, 16424A.
Bennett, Charles Iverson, Jr., 16442A.
Bersanti, Norman Phillip, 16464A.
Betterton, Robert Andrew, 16469A.
Biagini, Arthur Thomas, 16456A.
Blankenship, Jack Ford, 16463A.
Brown, Leslie Albert, Jr., 16452A.
Brown, Melvin George, 16447A.
Brown, Raymond, Jr., 16375A.
Bryan, Raymond Joseph, 16453A.
Bueker, Gustav Henry, 16297A.
Burdick, Joseph Burns, 16328A.
Byrum, Gerald Benton, 16422A.
Campbell, Leslie James, Jr., 16397A.
Campbell, Russell Clifton, 16461A.
Carruthers, Warren L., 16348A.
Catallo, Albert Louis, 16400A.
Catlin, Benjamin Shields, 3d, 16304A.
Cavanaugh, William Joseph, 16356A.
Christopher, Richard Stuart, 16406A.
Clarke, Robert Eugene, 16448A.
Cloppas, William Peter James, 16431A.
Coleman, Walter Vincent, Jr., 16480A.
Conover, John Martin, Jr., 16399A.
Courtney, Clyde William, 16321A.
Craig, William Lloyd, 16319A.
Cranford, Earl Christie, 16465A.
Creech, William Turlington, 16310A.
Crowder, Charlie E., Jr., 16299A.
Crumley, Paul Marcus, 16379A.
Curtis, Curtis Dee, 16475A.
Dame, Edward William, 16446A.
Dart, Melvin, 16320A.
Dick, Reay Stewart, 16377A.
Dietrich, William Allen, 16351A.
Dixon, Billy Vaughn, 16425A.

Dulle, Albert Benjamin, 16476A.
Eagle, Garland Worsham, 16372A.
Eichenberg, Paul Lawrence, 16330A.
Faulkner, Joseph, 16370A.
Fenton, Albert Joseph, 16390A.
Ferris, Paul Vincent, Jr., 16336A.
Finley, Allen Albert, 16385A.
Fong, George Harry, Jr., 16303A.
Ford, Milton Raymond, 16417A.
Fort, William Grady, 16432A.
Fox, Arthur Allwin, 16326A.
Franklin, Benjamin Lester, 16363A.
Galloway, Robert Clifford, 16407A.
Gessner, Louis Francis, 16322A.
Giraud, John Charles, 16296A.
Glass, Donald Ray, 16416A.
Glover, Douglas Caywood, 16479A.
Gordon, Earl Hugh, 16307A.
Green, Kenneth Joseph, 16384A.
Guier, William Carl, 16386A.
Halferty, Robert Marlin, 16438A.
Hammond, George Raymond, 16437A.
Hardin, Clarence Carter, 16306A.
Harkiewicz, Joseph, 16323A.
Harman, Robert Watson, 16449A.
Harrell, Jesse Russell, Jr., 16409A.
Harrington, Charles Edward, 16401A.
Herndon, James Everette, 16365A.
Higgins, Leo Andrew, 16408A.
Hoag, James Henry, Jr., 16393A.
Hobday, Henry Clark, Jr., 16428A.
Holcomb, Thomas Harry, 16410A.
Hooten, William Jerry, 16466A.
Horangic, Nicholas Phillip, 16478A.
Hurley, James Cecil, 16403A.
Irwin, Donald Stretton, 16360A.
Jabara, James, 16309A.
Jarvis, Irby B., Jr., 16383A.
Jenkins, Woodrow Walton, 16342A.
Johnson, Andrew, Jr., 16391A.
Johnson, Edward James, 16378A.
Johnston, James Emery, Jr., 16433A.
Jones, Lois Catherine, 21399W.
Jones, Robert Harold, 16473A.
Kahley, Don Eldred, 16439A.
Kaltman, Semen Edison, 16434A.
Keen, Robert James, 16331A.
Kelley, Jack Woodrow, 16474A.
Knight, James Arthur, Jr., 16415A.
Krug, Robert Anthony, 16347A.
Laatsch, Oliver Frederick, 16378A.
Laney, A. Louis, 16367A.
Larkins, James Randall, 16468A.
Leidemer, Henry Martin, 16457A.
Levens, Thomas Otis, 16315A.
Luke, Miles Kenyon, 16302A.
Luke, William Harry, 16402A.
Manning, Clark Preston, 16312A.
Mateny, Henry, 16359A.
Matthews, Charles Lewis, 16413A.
Maybell, James Lewis, 16435A.
McCarty, Charles Pennington, 16405A.
McCauley, Roger Allan, 16427A.
McGaw, James Elis, 16395A.
McKeever, Wendell Earle, 16361A.
McNeilly, Charles Richard, 16454A.
Menzie, William Robert, 16388A.
Merrill, William Lake, 16362A.
Middleton, Henry McQuinn, Jr., 16394A.
Miller, John Joseph, 16371A.
Milton, John Lewis, 16392A.
Moes, Gene Anthony, 16325A.
Montel, John Phillip, 16412A.
Myers, Earl Eugene, 16396A.
O'Brien, Edward Anthony, 16353A.
Osborn, Arthur Levern, 16350A.
Pancake, Dale Corwin, 16380A.
Perreault, Lucien Edmund, Jr., 16366A.
Perry, Frank Vinton, 16389A.
Popp, Vern Burnett, 16462A.
Porter, Wayne Charles, 16440A.
Powell, Billie Warren, 16376A.
Poynor, James Lester, 16419A.
Prater, Otis Adolphus, 16332A.
Reese, Eugene Kenneth, 16458A.
Reese, William Howard, 16311A.
Risinger, Fred Self, Jr., 16368A.
Roberts, Lloyd, 16346A.
Robinson, Thomas Mozart, 16420A.
Romans, James Walter, Jr., 16314A.
Romberg, Robert Peter, 16301A.

Ross, Donald Henry, 16313A.
Ross, S. L., Jr., 16382A.
Rossman, Russell John, 16429A.
Routh, William Nelson, 16426A.
Sapp, Glenn Everett, 16358A.
Sautters, Clyde Walter, 16333A.
Scott, George Sherman, 16421A.
Schmidt, Carvel Walter, 16443A.
Schmidt, Gordon Allen, 16308A.
Shaffer, Robert Lee, 16436A.
Shaver, Dorwyn Davis, 16317A.
Shepherd, William Charles, 16327A.
Sheppard, William LaVere, 16381A.
Sherman, Robert Frank, 16477A.
Sitton, Ray Benjamin, 16345A.
Smith, Marshall Lavern, 16295A.
Staggs, Homer, Jr., 16341A.
Stanley, Richard Eri, 16364A.
Stevenson, Charles Stanley, 16339A.
Sullivan, Ronald Joseph, 16335A.
Thumser, Louis Francis, Jr., 16414A.
Thurber, George Franklin, 16444A.
Ulrich, Robert James, 16334A.
Usis, Felix Max, Jr., 16430A.
Van Vleet, Gerald Engel, 16318A.
Vincent, Donald Wayne, 16343A.
Vines, John Henry, 16298A.
Wagner, William Tobias, 3d, 16369A.
Wahl, Richard Grant, 16467A.
Walker, Harry Carroll, Jr., 16450A.
Wallace, John Nelson, Jr., 16411A.
Weber, Arthur Evans, 16316A.
Weed, William Arthur, 16387A.
Weems, Monard Derald, 16355A.
Wheless, James Ewing, 16300A.
Whisner, William Thomas, Jr., 16324A.
Williams, Jesse Grady, 16455A.
Williamson, William Brown, Sr., 16374A.
Winters, Sterling Price, Jr., 16354A.
Young, Donald John, 16470A.

MEDICAL

Alfred, Harry Charles, 21908A.
Arnold, Harry Dudley, Jr., 19370A.
Baker, Neill Henry, 19756A.
Cote, Richard Henry, 19545A.
Curnutt, Hugh Holt, 19760A.
Hogan, Peter Donelin, 20837A.
Janssen, Gerriet Arthur, 19611A.
Jones, Lewis Edward, 19374A.
Keegan, James Wagner, 21731A.
Kohl, John Michael, 19965A.
Louis, Harold John, 20526A.
Meyerding, Eugene Villaume, 19371A.
Ownby, Fred Dillard, 19368A.
Rieger, Bela Redey, 19610A.
Russell, Henry Thomas, 19373A.
Sowka, Albin Joseph, 19372A.
Weber, Charles John, Jr., 19757A.
Wilkins, Harold Edward, 19369A.
Wingfield, Robert Clark, 19609A.

MEDICAL SERVICE

Bines, William Holland, Jr., 19526A.
Share, James Marion, 19527A.

To be first lieutenants

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

Ahner, Lyle L., 17960A.
Ahrends, Stanley W., 17979A.
Allen, Ledewey Ellis, Jr., 22742A.
Amador, Earl M., 17944A.
Arndt, Paul Cahoon, 22726A.
Ausburn, Franklin E., 17939A.
Bachman, Jay Gainer, 20752A.
Baird, Jacob C., 22736A.
Barnard, Martin J., 17956A.
Barre, Louis Albin, 3d, 20753A.
Beebe, Donald Edwin, 22755A.
Berry, Harry M., 17967A.
Bishop, Tedd L., 17951A.
Christenson, Adrain L., 17949A.
Cole, Daryl D., 17953A.
Cramer, Darrell Stuart, 22758A.
Curry, Clarence G., Jr., 22725A.
Disharoon, John Franklin, Jr., 22727A.
Eddington, John J., 22756A.
Fedro, William E., 17945A.
Femmer, William H., 17958A.
Gilbert, William Wayne, 20738A.
Gillespie, Clinton G., 17943A.
Gray, Edmond D., 22746A.

him before, except for the fact that he was not present at San Francisco. I was paying tribute to those who were present. I agree wholeheartedly that he should be brought into the picture. Because of the work which he did in the years following the surrender of Japan, he laid the foundation for a new relationship between the United States and the Far East, and especially with the Japanese people.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEELY in the chair). The time of the Senator from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator may be permitted to respond to a brief inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Does not the Senator from New Jersey feel that the conference was an example of what President Wilson once called open covenants openly arrived at? In other words, we had a meeting in San Francisco which not only was public, and to which the public had been invited, to the extent that facilities permitted, but the entire conference was visible to the American people over television, thus affording them an opportunity to understand the problems and hear the points of view of various nations. Does not the Senator also believe that had it been possible for past conferences to be held in such an atmosphere, secret agreements, such as the one at Yalta, would never have been made, because they would not have stood the light of day and the searching view of the American people?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I agree entirely with the distinguished Senator from California. A new precedent has been established in dealing with international issues of this kind. I again desire to pay tribute to Mr. Dulles for his magnificent leadership and, as the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] has stated, to General MacArthur as well.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to the city of San Francisco, the home city of my distinguished colleague, and to express my personal appreciation on the floor of the Senate for the wonderful way in which the city of San Francisco handled all matters connected with the conference. The way the mayor of San Francisco handled the details, and the way Governor Warren conducted himself in attending the sessions and participating in the welcome was a demonstration of Americanism at its best. The great State of California is to be congratulated for bringing the representatives of the various nations together in an atmosphere of friendliness. It is an inspiration for the future.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to address an inquiry to the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, now that we have made such splendid progress in

establishing new relations with Japan and bringing her into the family of nations, with several members of the Committee on Foreign Relations being present and participating in the signing of the treaty, does not the Senator from New Jersey feel that there is an obligation on the part of the Senate to proceed at the earliest practicable time to complete the work by ratifying the treaty?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I believe the Senator's point is very well taken. Of course the question arises as to what is the earliest practicable time. I know that the subject was discussed at some length at San Francisco. We had in mind the problem of Japan ratifying the treaty first, and we did not know how long that would take. Some other questions perhaps might have to be considered also. It is difficult at the moment to say whether the earliest practicable time would be next week, next month, or some other time. I cannot answer that question. There are many matters to be explored. I discussed the subject at San Francisco with the Secretary of State and Mr. Dulles. All of us were thinking in terms of how rapidly we could bring the whole matter to early consummation.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, H. R. 5054.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5054) making appropriations for the National Security Council, the National Security Resources Board, and for military functions administered by the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the first committee amendment passed over.

The first amendment passed over was, under the heading "Department of Defense—Military functions—Title II—Office of the Secretary of Defense—Salaries and expenses," on page 3, line 15, after the word "conclusive", to strike out "\$13,800,000" and insert "\$14,450,000."

THE JAPANESE PEACE TREATY AND THE FUTURE OF ASIA

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the Japanese Peace Treaty just signed at San Francisco marked the final official slap at Nationalist China when the representatives of that great nation were not invited to sit in on the final treaty conference with Japan.

Nationalist China carried the load of the fighting for approximately 10 years, yet her leaders were completely ignored through the entire negotiations leading up to the draft of the treaty.

Consequently, it marks the end for Nationalist China, engineered by our own State Department. The way has been paved for the recognition of Communist China by Japan, which will happen within a comparatively short time, unless the public should realize what the

administration's long-range program really is and prevents such recognition.

We have been able to postpone the recognition of Communist China by the United Nations by informing the people of the real plan of our own State Department to maneuver such recognition while giving the impression that they are opposed to it.

ACHESON WILL NOT USE VETO TO PREVENT RECOGNITION OF COMMUNIST CHINA

Mr. Acheson came back from his European trip early in 1950 and in an hour-long speech before a joint meeting of Congress told us nothing that we had not heard 50 times before, or that had not been previously stated by his henchmen, except, buried in one paragraph in the middle of his speech—leading up to it fast and getting away from it fast—he said that we would not use the veto to prevent recognition of Communist China by the United Nations.

He has never changed his attitude. He has never changed the statement.

ACHESON'S RECOGNITION

Riding high on the great job which the public is led to believe has been done on the Japanese Treaty, he will probably resign his job within 30 or 60 days, and we will get another man of the same type as Secretary of State. It will make no difference in the planned loss of China followed by Asia.

JAPAN'S COMING RECOGNITION OF COMMUNIST CHINA

Why will Japan recognize Communist China? It will be because the United States of America, through the State Department, has made it impossible for them to recognize any other Chinese government.

We have held Chiang Kai-shek in Formosa, refusing to allow him to gain the mainland and turn the conflict back into a Chinese civil war. Our great State Department was able within 5 years following the end of World War II, to turn the Chinese civil war into a war between the United States and Communist China; a great accomplishment.

We have been appropriating for Japan about three-quarters of a billion dollars each year since World War II. When we stop appropriating these funds, which, of course, we must eventually do, Japan must make its own living.

FREE TRADE—AND \$750,000,000 ANNUALLY TO JAPAN

We now have free trade with Japan. They are sending their sewing machines, Christmas cards, precision instruments, and 101 other things, which under normal conditions would disarrange our American economy through displacing American investments and the American workingmen's jobs. However, by continued emergencies we are able, through higher taxes, new money from the sale of bonds to the American people, to keep our economy going. Eventually we must protect our own higher standard of living from the 7 to 15 cents per hour Japanese labor.

Then when we stop sending three-quarters of a billion dollars to Japan annually they must trade with China.

She must buy her raw materials and sell her manufactured articles there. The final downfall of Nationalist China was the brutal State Department action in utterly ignoring the almost century-old friendship of China and probably one of the few nations whose interests are parallel with our own.

We shall without doubt resume the peace negotiations at Kaesong within a very short time, and there will be peace in Korea, and we shall agree to confine our activities in Asia to a few miles beyond the thirty-eighth parallel as already outlined; then there will be no more interference with Russia's activities in consolidating her gains in Nationalist China and in Asia during the next 15 or 20 months or perhaps 2 years.

KILLING, IMPRISONING, AND ENSLAVING NATIONALIST CHINA'S LEADERS

Recently there appeared an Associated Press dispatch stating that 237 Nationalist Chinese had been executed. The Chinese Communists are executing the Nationalist leaders in China who might oppose the consolidation of Russia's gains in that area. The same dispatch stated that 3,000 Nationalist Chinese were imprisoned. We understand upon good authority that many of those 3,000 prisoners and many other Chinese Nationalist prisoners who were not reported in the press are on their way to the slave camps in Russia.

SOVIET RUSSIA WILL MOVE THROUGH BURMA

When Russia consolidates her gains in Communist China, she will move through Burma. Already the Communist Chinese control the northern half of Burma. They controlled most of Burma when I was in Rangoon, Burma, in 1948. They had just shot all the Cabinet at that time, and then had appointed a new set of Cabinet officers; they play no favorites there.

So when Russia takes over Burma, which she can easily do, and then moves into Siam, Russia will take over the principal rice crop of Asia, for the surplus rice which is grown in Siam is shipped to the Malayan States and to Indochina. Then Russia will control the food supply, and eventually she will move into the Malayan States and Indochina.

EYES OF AMERICANS FOCUSED ON EUROPE

Mr. President, while we are losing China and Asia, the eyes of the American people are being diverted to Europe, principally by means of the large appropriations which our Government is making for European aid. This august body just passed an authorization bill calling for \$7,200,000,000—passed with very little understanding of the real impact upon the American taxpayer.

We shall lose China and Asia while we are dissipating our substance in Europe. It is a bottomless pit. General Marshall now says that, instead of the 6 divisions, totaling 90,000 men, going to Europe, we will send 400,000 men there. In a comparatively short time, he or his successor, will probably advocate twice that number.

Mr. President, overpopulation is Europe's problem. They have at least 20 percent more men than can ever find

employment there. Whatever foot soldiers are needed in Europe should be supplied by the European countries—it simply aggravates the food supply to send more.

EUROPEAN COUNTRIES TRADING WITH RUSSIA

The European countries at the same time are sending to Russia the raw and other manufactured industrial equipment and processed goods which she needs to consolidate her gains in the iron-curtain countries and to fight world war III with us.

A bill was just passed by the Senate, advertised throughout the Nation by the administration as a bill to stop the trade between the European countries and Russia, the iron-curtain and other Communist countries including Communist China. The trade had already been stopped by the Kem-Wherry-Malone amendment, except for the joker which was slipped into the amendment in conference, with the result that the amendment then allowed the President to exempt certain nations from the restriction. The President did exempt certain countries.

The new bill repealed outright the Kem-Wherry-Malone amendment, and permitted the decisions in regard to such matters to be made by an administrator, appointed by the President, who already has shown that he will allow the trade to continue—after Britain laid down an ultimatum to him that she intended to continue such trade. So, Mr. President, the administration bill provides that after the Administrator confers with the Secretary of State and with the Secretary of Commerce, he will make up his own mind as to what trade will be allowed.

We know what trade will be allowed then: The trade will continue as usual; the European countries will continue to send to Russia, the iron-curtain countries, and Communist China, the goods which they cannot produce, but which they need in order to consolidate their gains and to prepare for a third world war.

We must give Stalin credit for having more brains and better judgment than to attempt to cut off such trade.

THE ADMINISTRATION POLICY HAS LOST CHINA

Mr. President, there will not be a war in Europe in the next 2 or 3 years; and there will not be a war in Asia, because we are permitting Stalin to consolidate his gains in Communist China and in Asia and furnishing him the necessary manufactured goods via the ECA in Europe.

Our Secretary of State has succeeded in laying the groundwork to lose Asia, which means ultimately the loss of Europe, once the Communists consolidate their gains in Asia. Within 5 years we probably shall date history from the loss of China. It is of that importance.

NO FOOT SOLDIERS OUTSIDE WESTERN HEMISPHERE—SHOULD BUILD AIR GROUPS AND SUBMARINE FLEETS

Of course, Mr. President, we never should have sent a foot soldier to Korea. We never should have sent a foot soldier to Europe as such. We should build a sufficient number of air groups—not

the 45 air groups the President actually started in 1948, not the 54 air groups which he recommended, and not even confined to 70 air groups which the Senate authorized in 1948, but which the President refused to build.

What we need is 200 air groups to control the air over any area in the world, either in Europe or Asia, that is important to our ultimate safety. We also should build the necessary submarine fleets to blockade any nation which seeks to move into those areas. That is what we need and must have.

CHINA AND ASIA COULD HAVE BEEN SAVED

There was a time, last fall, when General MacArthur said that we should destroy the war industry of southern Manchuria and blockade the Chinese coast. I saw the southern Manchuria industry in 1948. If we had followed General MacArthur's recommendations, China and Asia would have been saved, and there would have been no war. Everyone now knows that to be so.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUNT in the chair). Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. MALONE. I am glad to yield to the distinguished junior Senator from Washington.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Nevada has just stated that, from his point of view, history will begin from the loss of China.

HISTORY—AND THE LOSS OF CHINA

Mr. MALONE. I said it is important enough in world events that history could be dated from the loss of China, because the loss of China is the most important thing that has happened in a century of time.

Mr. CAIN. I am reminded that not long ago in San Francisco a peace treaty with Japan was written and was signed by more than a score of nations. In due time, and we hope it will be soon, Japan will have her sovereignty restored to her.

Can the Senator from Nevada give us any information regarding the government within China with whom Japan is likely to sign a peace treaty? I ask the question because it was not discussed, to my knowledge, in what otherwise was a satisfactory gathering in San Francisco.

Mr. MALONE. I would say to the junior Senator from Washington that it is obvious that there is in China no other government except the Communist government with whom Japan can sign a peace treaty, because Japan must trade with Communist China. So the government of Communist China will be the government with which Japan will sign the peace treaty; brought about by the United States of America's final repudiation of the Nationalist Chinese government in the negotiations leading up to and the signing of the Japanese treaty at San Francisco.

The move in San Francisco was simply the last one of a long series, which now have resulted in a clear repudiation of the Nationalist government of China.

We will agree not to interfere with the affairs of China while Russia consolidates her gains there. So the treaty

It is time that we called a halt and examined critically the actions by irresponsible people in the State Department.

Mr. President, we cannot have the largest army in the world, the largest navy in the world, and the largest air force in the world.

What we must consider is how the next war will be fought. Within the next 6 months or 1 year the answer to that question will be so plain that the schoolchildren of our country will understand it.

It is obvious that the next war will be fought under the sea and in the air.

Today we have 3,500,000 soldiers. Instead, we need at least 3,000,000 men in the Air Force. We need a large Air Force, much larger than the army of foot soldiers.

So let us have a powerful Air Force of 200 air groups or whatever number may be needed. We can develop such an air force and we can control the air over any area in the world currently important to our ultimate safety. We should build a submarine fleet sufficient to blockade any nation seeking to move into any area important to us.

Mr. President, I hope we have heard the last of the idle talk of isolationism. Every man who does not go off the deep end is branded an isolationist.

So long as the Secretary of State speaks; so long as the President says we need \$10,000,000,000, \$8,000,000,000, or \$5,000,000,000 for Europe, with the Amos and Andy chant, "Do not read it, there is no necessity of reading it," it is going to pass anyway. It is isolationism, Mr. President, when we ask for details. It will be remembered that when we debated on the Senate floor, and in the hearings, the great Marshall plan—which Marshall himself never understood—the junior Senator from Nevada asked that a few sensible conditions be placed on the furnishing of the money: First, a United States of Europe, or a customs union, which would prevent each one of these countries continuing as a government of dictators, kings, or princes, with no cooperation at all with each other. Each with their royal family to be retired as Belgium's King was recently retired on \$120,000 annually—I point out that \$120,000 is the annual pay of eight United States Senators.

But that was only one of them. There are many more European countries which retain royalty, whom we shall support for the rest of their lives in the style to which they have become accustomed, when they are retired. There was no condition imposed of a United States of Europe. We never determined where the money was going or why. Should a United States Senator, elected by a sovereign State, try to determine where the taxpayers' money was going? That would be a terrible thing; it might set a precedent in the United States Senate—it might run counter to the bipartisan policy. The junior Senator from Nevada asked that a condition be attached that the European countries guarantee the integrity of private investments, before we poured our money into their countries. No; we could not do

that, but we can initiate the great point 4 program, so that we guarantee the integrity of our own investments any place in the world. Is that not a wonderful idea—try that on a banker some time—try to get him to guarantee the integrity of the investment you mean to make with the money you borrow from him. Yes, it is silly, but we are doing it.

The junior Senator from Nevada also suggested that the United States should have access to the markets of the world which we are committed to defend. There could be no colonialism under that system. It would mean that any country in the world could fix an import fee or a tariff to protect its own workers and investments, but no country could force a third country to fix such tariffs or import fees to favor its own trade. They call such rates Empire preferential rates. The great free-trade masquerade has been debated on the floor of the Senate under the name of reciprocal trade, under which the products of any nation of the world may come into this country without regard to that differential of cost by the differences in the wage standard of living. A continual emergency must exist in order to enable the Government to get more money from the taxpayers and to get more money through the sale of bonds to keep the economy rolling.

If we were to abandon that course, within 90 days the economy of this country would crumble.

As a matter of fact, since 1934 there has been a deliberate plan to wreck the economy of this Nation—through free trade, deficit financing, taxes manipulated to discourage private investments—and the SEC.

In the opinion of the junior Senator from Nevada it was never intended that any regulatory body of any State or of the Nation should have the power to determine feasibility before allowing the sale of stock. No; it was meant that the regulatory body should determine that the prospective buyer of the stock is being told the truth; that is all.

Mr. President, there is one other action that assisted in wrecking the economy of this country. No one is trying to stop inflation. The effort to make it appear that the President wants to stop inflation is the greatest hoax ever sold to this country. If the President wants to stop inflation he can stop it. He is afraid to stop it. In 1934 we cut the string that tied the money to a sound principle of financing. That is, the metal behind it. The gold and the silver. We cut that string, and the balloon has been soaring ever since. No one knows where it is now. We would like to know. We would like to know the status of our currency in terms of inflation, so that the gold price could again be fixed and back up the currency. The money which we use for a common exchange must be based upon confidence in such medium of exchange—that confidence is rapidly disappearing.

SNYDER INSISTS NO RISE IN GOLD PRICE

I note an article under the headline "Snyder insistent on no rise in gold; interrupts talks with western ministers

to say United States will not consent to higher price," which appeared in the New York Times, Saturday, September 8.

Mr. President, the last thing in the world which this administration wants to do is to stop inflation. They do not want to tie up the inflation balloon which is destroying our currency. They want the inflation of the dollar bill to continue to soar.

STOLEN ONE-HALF OF SAVINGS AND INSURANCE

The Senate of the United States has been a party to deliberately stealing more than one-half the savings and the insurance and the incomes of the people of the United States of America—the Senate, the House, and the administration have stolen them deliberately; and we are keeping up the theft—stealing more of the people's savings every day through inflation.

Mr. President, I shall close by saying that, though what I have described may be called bipartisanship, under it a number of unfortunate treaties have been put over. Now we hear lauded to the skies, Secretary of State who was a party to the Japanese Peace Treaty, and who was a party to everything that is now resulting in the loss of China with the ultimate loss of Asia. There is no choice for the Japanese people, who are customarily hard working people. They can fight and they can work and they will do both, but they will have to do what they are told, and they will have to join Communist China because we have brought about the loss of China to the Communists.

We are the ones who destroyed Nationalist China. The last backhanded slap in the face of Nationalist China and their ruination was the failure to recognize them at the San Francisco Conference, or to collaborate with them in the preparation of the Japanese treaty.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, the article entitled "Snyder Insistent on No Rise in Gold," which appeared in the New York Times, Saturday, September 8, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SNYDER INSISTENT ON NO RISE IN GOLD—INTERRUPTS TALKS WITH WESTERN MINISTERS TO SAY UNITED STATES WILL NOT CONSENT TO HIGHER PRICE

(By Felix Belair, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, September 7.—Secretary of the Treasury John W. Snyder interrupted talks with the finance ministers of Britain, France and Italy today to say the United States remained unalterably opposed to any increase in the price of gold over the figure of \$35 an ounce in effect since 1934.

Anticipating a renewal of demands to raise the price at next week's meeting of the International Monetary Fund and International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, Secretary Snyder told a news conference he could see no good reason for the United States Government to pay a higher price for gold.

Secretary Snyder and other top-level officials of the Treasury and State Departments are being sounded out by the visiting delegations for their reaction to economic problems of their separate countries.

DEARER GOLD HELD INFLATIONARY

It was the Secretary's position that nothing would contribute more to a world-wide inflation of prices than an increase in the price of newly mined gold.

The demands of official protocol having been met, Secretary Snyder and Hugh Gaitskell, Britain's Chancellor of the Exchequer, sat down with their experts today to talk about Britain's current economic and financial problems and the worse ones in prospect.

There was no particular upshot of the talks and none is expected. In substance, the British are trying to explain well in advance of the fact why it may be necessary later to take certain unpalatable economic decisions.

Britain's terms of trade have been running against her. In consequence, her balance of payments has taken an unfavorable turn. Mr. Gaitskell is telling this Government that it will be necessary to reduce imports from the United States still further.

Solid rows of statistics have been submitted to the Treasury that suggest that Britain sees no other way out; that it may become necessary for Britain to force exports on the world market in order to keep up income. She will have to deprive her nationals of consumer goods to make this possible.

It is implicit in the explanation of British payment difficulties that it is to be hoped the United States will appreciate the circumstances that makes necessary the unpopular course of action to come but that it will have to come, no matter how much fuss is made about it on this side.

Substantially the same line of explanation is expected from Mr. Gaitskell at the meeting next week of the International Monetary Fund. The fund's articles require that members remove restrictions on international payments by next March. Britain has no intention of removing her exchange restrictions or to end discrimination against dollar imports.

This position will have to be communicated to the fund, since the subject of exchange restrictions has a prominent place on the agenda of the meeting and the fund has announced it will soon press for abandonment or modification of present restrictions on payments.

BRITAIN TO SEEK 5 YEARS' GRACE

Britain is expected to move eventually for amendment of the articles of agreement to provide another 5 years of grace, during which existing trade and payments restrictions may be maintained. It is unlikely, however, that the British position will be thus formalized until some time later.

Secretary Snyder told his news conference that there had been no mention in his talks with Mr. Gaitskell of the possibility that Britain might take advantage of the waiver clause in the Anglo-American loan agreement to avoid payment of interest due next December 31. Of the \$119,000,000 payment due on the loan, interest accounts for \$74,000,000.

On another phase of Mr. Gaitskell's conversation here, a spokesman for Charles E. Wilson, Defense Mobilization Director, denied reports current yesterday that every American effort would be made to assure Britain delivery of between 2,000,000 and 3,000,000 tons of American steel during the next year.

Mr. Wilson, himself, had used these figures before talking with Mr. Gaitskell as the amount of steel the British would like to have from the United States. As it happened, however, Mr. Gaitskell asked only for 500,000 to 750,000 tons.

Accordingly, an announcement today by the Economic Cooperation Administration said it would review an Office of Defense Mobilization request for 800,000 tons of steel for Britain during the year ahead after considering domestic requirements and the re-

quests of other foreign claimants for American steel.

Reports that Mr. Wilson had told Mr. Gaitskell that he would endeavor to get 2,000,000 to 3,000,000 tons for Britain's rearmament program "if the economy of the United States could spare the metal," brought prompt and critical reaction in Congress today. Despite assurances by Mr. Wilson's aides that no firm commitment was made at the meeting and an outright denial that any set amount of steel had been promised, Members of Congress leveled criticism at Mr. Wilson.

Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ, Democrat of New Mexico, said he was "extremely distressed" to learn that Mr. Gaitskell had obtained even a qualified pledge of "two to three tons of American steel next year."

He added that any steel shipped to Britain would have to be taken away from the construction of American schools, hospitals, and roads.

Senator SPESSARD L. HOLLAND, Democrat of Florida, told the Senate that he strongly supported Senator CHAVEZ' statement.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5054) making appropriations for the National Security Council, the National Security Resources Board, and for military functions administered by the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, every Member of the Senate recognizes the critical emergency situation which requires the large appropriations for the Department of Defense embodied in House bill 5054.

The appropriations authorized in the bill total more than \$61,000,000,000. Everyone recognizes the impact on our economy which such vast expenditures involve, especially in view of the fact that two-thirds of the total involved in the pending bill will go for procurement and construction.

As a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I know how carefully every item in the military budget has been examined, and the hours of work that have been devoted to hearings and study of these items by members of the Subcommittee on Armed Services, the staff, and all other members of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. President, I have examined the amendments which, in the name of economy, have been offered to the bill. I am for economy, and I know that the Senators who have offered the amendments are sincerely endeavoring to bring about economy in the Government; but, having sat as a member of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Armed Services and listened to representatives of the military, of the Atomic Energy Commission, and officials of the Defense Department, I have come to the conclusion that the figures arrived at by the Appropriations Committee, rather than representing a measure for war, are the best figures to effect the greatest economy that can be attained, while still maintaining and developing the defense of the country against aggression and attack. For that reason, Mr. President, I shall find it necessary to vote against the amendments and to support the recommendations of the Committee on Appropriations, of which I am a member.

We sat through long hours of hearings and studied each and every item of expenditure. I recognize the fact that the need for economy in all Government expenditures is imperative. It cannot be confined to the ordinary functions of the Government alone. It must embrace the military expenditures as well. The very nature of the situation, however, makes it difficult to impose the type of reductions and budget savings that have been approved with reference to other bills.

Therefore, our emphasis in the case of military expenditures must be on the side of efficiency and the strong determination to get full value for every dollar spent. That is why, Mr. President, I introduced on May 28 Senate Joint Resolution 145, to create a watchdog committee to continue to examine the expenditures of funds both at the military and the domestic level or at the administrative level.

I reemphasize that there is a need to examine every dollar of expenditures in order that there may be economy. Such a watchdog committee as that to which I have referred functioned in the interest of the American people during the years of World War II. It is needed again at this time, just as it was needed then. I earnestly hope that the Committee on Appropriations will favorably report Senate Joint Resolution 145, and that it will have the wholehearted support of the Senate.

Mr. President, there was a provision in the appropriation bill which was referred to in the subcommittee as the Van Zandt rider, or amendment. While I recognize the soundness of the reasons the committee had for recommending elimination of section 604 (b) of the bill, I am in complete sympathy with the purpose of the House in adding this section in an effort to relieve some of the injustice and unfairness in connection with inactive and voluntary reservists by providing for their more rapid release at this time. We must not lose sight of that objective. The handling of the personnel problem as it concerns the Inactive Reserve has been shocking in many instances.

Like every other Member of Congress, I have hundreds of letters in my files from young men, many of them combat veterans of World War II, protesting against the policy of recall of inactive reservists, and citing the extreme hardship which they and their families have undergone.

These are men who never received 1 cent of pay or underwent any training, and they thought they would not be recalled to active duty except in case of war or extreme national emergency. Meanwhile members of the Organized Reserves, who received drill pay and participated in training, have not been recalled. There are reasons for this, but the fact remains that the individual does not understand them. His morale is seriously undermined by a question as to the good faith of the Government.

I personally believe that we have very seriously damaged the national welfare by these policies, and I think the situation will have an adverse effect on our military program and the build-up of a

strong Reserve program for many years to come.

At the same time, I recognize that serious damage could be done to the orderly release program which is now under way, that it may weaken our defense at this critical time, and that the arguments offered by the Department of Defense make clear that it would be wiser to eliminate the provision in the bill. At the same time we must have assurance that our military authorities will in every possible way seek to remedy the inequities which have been so distressing to the American people, and release the inactive reservists at the earliest possible date, because they should not have been called back into the Armed Forces to serve on active duty.

Through their loyalty to their Government, many young men joined with friends of theirs to become members of the Inactive Reserve. When the Korean crisis came, they were immediately called to active duty, thus giving service to their country a second time, although many young men were eligible who had never rendered military service a day in their lives.

A strong Organized Reserve Corps program, taking into consideration all the potential resources of civilian components of the armed services, such as the National Guard, is generally recognized as an essential factor in the military strength of the United States. Coupled with the Military Training and Service Act, recently enacted, such a program is the real alternative to large standing military forces.

We have a supreme obligation, in connection with developing a comprehensive Reserve act, to provide adequate assurance that these deplorable mistakes will not happen again. We must do this by developing a sound Reserve program as a vital part of our national defense, providing for adequate training of all reserves, adjusting inequities in the recall to active duty, placing Reserve personnel on a par with others in military service, and restoring confidence in the Reserve program.

Mr. President, we are mindful of the extreme difficulties our Military Establishment faced in recruiting sufficient trained manpower to meet the sudden emergency brought on by the Communist aggression in Korea, but we must face the stern fact that the national administration has fallen far short in its handling of military manpower during this crisis. The brunt of the injustice has fallen on the Inactive and Volunteer Reserves. They have protested with proper American indignation, but they have also served magnificently in every post of duty.

The American people may never fully know the debt they owe the young men who in the short space of a few years after military service in war have been called upon again to undergo the hazards and the hardships of combat duty.

Mr. President, there appeared in the Minneapolis Star of August 17 this year an editorial on this subject, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE SHOULD FORCE RELIEF OF INACTIVE RESERVISTS

The Star has kept still about the obvious injustice that's being done inactive reservists, in the hope that fighting would end in Korea and these reservists could, therefore, be released.

To argue for their release while the fighting continued and men were needed meant asking that one man be arbitrarily called up to replace another who had been arbitrarily called up. Weighing the relative injustice of calling reservists against calling draftees seemed beyond our editorial scope.

But the prospect of an early end to fighting in Korea is not very bright, and the Armed Forces' admitted mishandling of reservists is an open sore that should not be permitted to fester indefinitely.

The armed services have, from time to time, given Congress and the country assurances that they would heal this sore by replacing reservists. It's a harsh thing to say, but the armed services have not kept their word about this.

Robert W. Smith, a member of this staff who recently made a tour of military installations, found inactive reservists to a degree disaffected by the treatment they have received, and generally more interested in when they would be released than in their military duties.

The House of Representatives, against the advice of the chairman of its Armed Services Committee, has passed a rider to the military appropriations bill requiring the services to relieve inactive reservists by November 30.

The rider simply forbids the armed services to use any appropriated money to pay inactive reservists after that date. An existing provision of law forbids the services to hold a man who is not paid. A point of order was raised and then withdrawn. So the rider must be considered germane to the appropriations bill.

Chairman VINSON contended during debate on the rider that the services, particularly the Navy, could not spare the men by November 30. The House apparently did not believe him. Earlier assurances by the services about releasing the men seem to the Star to justify this disbelief.

It is regrettable that the injustice done Inactive Reserves should be corrected in this way. But this is probably the least regrettable feature of a very sorry job of military manpower handling.

In all the circumstances, the Star thinks the Senate should adopt the House amendment to compel the armed services to perform on their promises to the Inactive Reserves.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, yesterday on the floor of the Senate a colloquy took place between the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. It is not my purpose in any way to discuss the subject matter of the colloquy and the implications involved, or what was then charged, but I do wish to make an observation, and I make it as a member of the Subcommittee on Appropriations which considered this bill which is now before the Senate. The observation is that as a member of that committee I want the RECORD to show that I welcome any criticism of any appropriation recommended by the committee. That is what the Senate is for. A committee does its best to bring to the floor a bill which is justified, but if in the opinion of Senators an item can be cut—and makes no

difference to me whether it is in a civilian bill or in a military appropriation bill—if it can be cut it ought to be cut. I think it is the duty of every Member of the United States Senate to offer any amendment he cares to offer so the Senate may consider it in connection with the bill. I say that in all fairness to those who were engaged in the colloquy, and in fairness to the members of the Appropriations Committee who considered the bill. I was not permitted to attend all the hearings of the committee. I attended some of them. My administrative assistant, I think, attended the remainder of the hearings.

Mr. President, there are now only a few Members present on the floor of the Senate, but I wish to bring to the attention of those who are here the fact that we are considering an appropriation bill carrying a tremendous sum of money, \$31,100,000,000. Think of it, \$61,000,000,000. That is twice the amount of the appropriations for 1 year during the second World War; appropriations carried in bills I helped to pass.

Mr. President, we can talk about failure of foreign policy and bipartisanship, but finally we must realize that the stern realities which face the people of this country and the Senate involve the life and the future of the Republic. Certainly finances are involved, as well as the economic stability of this great country.

It might be thought that \$61,100,000,000 is all we shall be asked to appropriate. But, Mr. President, that is not all. The Congress has already approved an appropriation bill for military public works. The minimum figure of appropriations under that bill will be \$4,500,000,000. The maximum figure will be \$5,700,000,000. The contract authority runs into 1953 and 1954. That must be added to the \$61,100,000,000.

Then there is the Mutual Security Act, which has just been approved, carrying in the neighborhood of \$7,300,000,000. That amount must be added to the figures I have already given.

Then there will be a supplemental appropriation bill for the Air Force, because there is a growing feeling on the part of the Members of the Congress, which I am gratified to see, that the proper way to obtain national security is to emphasize air defense, rather than the way we are proceeding now, and have proceeded during the past 18 years. That bill is coming before the Appropriations Committee.

Then shortly we will have coming before us a bill to make up for the costs of the Korean War; I mean the costs which are in excess of the subsistence and the pay funds carried in the current military appropriation bill. The Korean War has put a severe drain upon implements of war, and upon our stockpile of strategic materials, to the extent that the minimum figure which it is estimated will be required to replace what we have expended, will run in the neighborhood of \$5,900,000,000. If that is added to the figures I have previously given we have a total defense budget of around \$85,000,000,000. I realize these are estimates, Mr. President, but they are the best estimates we can obtain.

They are appropriation estimates. We will spend such an amount of money this year or some other year. Add to that the civilian budget, which is approximately \$20,000,000,000, and we will have for the current year 1952, appropriations which total approximately \$105,000,000,000.

Mr. President, that is not the worst of it. In the fourth quarter of 1953 we are going to reach a higher peak of expenditure. Just as surely as Members are present today, if they are present a year from now they will be confronted with a budget which to my mind will far exceed in appropriations the figures I have given for the fiscal year 1952. I say that as a member of the Committee on Appropriations. I serve on seven subcommittees and know that the trend is mounting.

That is not all, Mr. President. Such great appropriations will not end in 1953, nor will they end in 1954. If we continue along the avenue on which we are now traveling my judgment is that such appropriations will continue for a period of years. To my mind the appropriations are in such huge amounts as simply to stun the American people.

My appeal today is that Senators give military appropriations their careful consideration. It is a vital bill. We are starting to travel on an avenue of appropriations for this purpose which will list a hundred billion dollars and more, for at least the next several years.

Much is said about the Japanese Peace Treaty. I hope and pray that it will prove successful, whether its foundation was bipartisan in nature or not. I think possibly the proof of whether it will be successful will depend upon how soon, if ever, Japan writes a treaty with Nationalist China.

I do not care to go into that subject now, because it deals with an entirely different matter than the one I am presenting to the Senate. But what I am stressing is that, with our foreign policy as it has been, and with the commitments we have made and are now making, and the authorizations which are before us, the Members of the Senate are confronted with appropriations this year which will exceed \$100,000,000,000. In the years immediately ahead, I am sure that much will have to be appropriated, and I would not be surprised if the total amount greatly exceeded \$100,000,000,000.

Of course, we always try to offset these staggering figures by saying: "While these huge amounts are appropriated, we are not going to spend all the money this year." I point out that of the \$61,000,000,000—of course, again, this is an estimate—it is estimated by the subcommittee that the expenditures under the bill will reach only a total of \$37,955,235,030 in fiscal 1952. That money will be spent this year. Moreover, the carry-overs, which are expected to be spent this year, will reach, according to the committee report, a total of \$44,278,000,000. The distinguished chairman of the subcommittee corrected that figure. He said that after the report was printed an error was discovered, and that the proper figure was in the neighborhood of \$37,000,000,000. It is peculiar

how such errors are discovered overnight. We go on the theory that we know what we are talking about, and then the figures are changed by \$5,000,000,000 or \$6,000,000,000. That has happened before, and will probably happen again. According to the report, the carry-overs which are available to be spent in this year amount to \$44,000,000,000. On the floor yesterday I asked the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee how much of this amount would be spent in 1952. Again he gave his best estimate. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] gave his estimate. One of them reached a figure of an \$18,000,000,000 carry-over, and the other a figure of \$22,000,000,000. But if we averaged these various estimates, the minimum figure suggested is still between \$56,000,000,000 and \$57,000,000,000 to be expended in this fiscal year. That is for this military appropriations alone.

It does not include what will be spent under the Mutual Security Act, which is approximately \$7,300,000,000. It does not include the military public works bill which will call for \$5,700,000,000. Then there will be the civilian budget, which will add another \$20,000,000,000. Then there will be certain supplemental bills. No one can tell me that such expenditures will not produce a terrific impact upon the economy of the United States. Yet, what dumbfounds me is that the President of the United States, in a speech today just reported over the news ticker, makes this statement:

Mr. Truman stressed the importance of continuing the pay-as-we-go approach to Federal finances.

Mr. President, it is certainly only an "approach." He is miles away from the pay-as-we-go road.

Speaking as a citizen of the State of Nebraska and a former member of the State legislature of that State, I can truthfully say that Nebraska is on a pay-as-you-go basis. The State of Nebraska cannot be bonded for more than \$100,000. That is the pay-as-you-go basis. We do not have everything that some other States have, but what we have is ours and it is paid for. It is almost impossible to believe that anyone could be so naive as to use the phrase "pay-as-you-go" as an approach to the Federal budget, after the spendthrift legislation and activities which have been going on for the past 18 or 20 years under the Democratic administration.

When the Eightieth Congress went on a pay-as-you-go basis, it was ridiculed. Even the language we used was ridiculed. Now the administration is adopting the pay-as-you-go basis as a slogan for spendthrifts who have no conception of what a balanced budget is, or how far they will go in financing wild schemes both at home and abroad.

I continue the quotation from the President:

As proof of the sound fiscal operation of the Government—

This is coming from President Truman—

he said that over the last 5 years the administration had operated with a surplus of nearly \$8,000,000,000.

Eight billion dollars of borrowed money of the taxpayers of the country. That is his surplus. We have had an artificial economy in this country for 20 years. It has been synthetic. To say that we have an actual surplus of \$8,000,000,000, in view of the fact that we have been on a basis of deficit spending for practically 20 years, is nonsensical.

"It is difficult to overstate how much the whole future of the world depends upon the financial condition of the United States Government," he said. "We have got to keep it solvent. We have got to keep it sound."

With those two statements I certainly agree. But we cannot keep it sound if we follow the path of Trumanism in the future, as we have followed the path of the Democratic administration for the past 20 years. I submit that it cannot be done.

This is pretty good:

After denouncing the use of "butterfly statistics" Mr. Truman said: "I would like to say a word to comfort and console those who fear that we are spending our way into national bankruptcy. Don't be afraid. This is something that has been worrying you for a number of years now. It is something you have been saying over and over again. It was not true when you began to say it. It has not been true as you have repeated it over and over since then, and now it is further from the truth than ever."

"Butterfly statistics." I suppose he is referring to some of the statements made by the junior Senator from Nebraska about selling this country down the road into national bankruptcy.

At the same time, following the President's speech, here are the figures for Government expenses and receipts for the current fiscal year through September 7, compared with a year ago. I wonder if these are the "butterfly statistics" to which the President is referring. Let us read them.

Government expenses and receipts for the current fiscal year, through September 7, compared with a year ago. That means since July 1 of this year. Expenses, this year, \$11,143,222,426.53; last year, for the same period, expenses, \$5,982,134,469.51. I suppose that is the approach to pay-as-you-go—a shortage of about \$6,000,000,000.

Deficit, \$4,553,648,001.86. Deficit a year ago, \$891,188,594.09.

Cash balance—the great cash balance of borrowed money—this year, \$3,927,664,255.24; last year, \$4,995,294,475.48.

Public debt, as of today—and it changes, of course, as interest payments are made, and some payments are made on the principal; then they borrow more, to make it greater—today, \$256,630,244,050.88; a year ago, \$257,823,539,920.31.

I wish to point out that within the next few months the refinancing of a great deal of this debt will be squarely upon the shoulders of the people of the country. What that debt will be as we go along with the deficit and the refinancing is going to be very difficult to estimate.

Gold reserves today, \$21,853,490,206.56. A year ago, \$23,576,612,443.89.

I submit to the Members of the Senate that this does not look as though we were getting on a pay-as-you-go basis. I submit to the Members of the Senate that

a debt of nearly \$257,000,000,000 should make us worry about the future of the economy of our country.

The Committee on Finance is about to bring forth a tax bill which will reach out and take additional taxes from the American people. When added to the taxes already levied and those paid to local and State governments, the total amount of taxes will represent a third of the national income of the country. Do Senators believe that our finances are sound? Do they believe that the future of the United States is "hunkydory," as the President of the United States says it is?

Mr. President, that is fuzzy thinking. Instead of "butterfly statistics," it is the butterfly taking honey out of pockets of the taxpayers of the United States, to continue the New Deal policies and the mistakes the administration has made. The people of the United States are facing not only a debt of \$257,000,000,000, but if we continue to appropriate money as we are about to appropriate it in the pending bill they are facing higher and higher taxes on their incomes and on everything they buy or use.

The people ought to know what the true story is, and the Members of the Senate ought to know it. For that reason I want the Members of the Senate to understand that I am perfectly willing to consider any amendment which is designed to cut any appropriation to a point where we can more nearly, if possible, make the expenditures fit the income of the Government, and at the same time provide the materials which may be needed for defense.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GEORGE in the chair). Does the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Would the Senator say that the new tax bill will be passed on "butterfly statistics"?

Mr. WHERRY. The best answer to that, I will say to the distinguished Senator from New Jersey, will be given by the taxpayers themselves. It will not be butter to them. It will not be honey to them, either.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I shall be glad to yield in a moment. I do not see how we can help vote a defense bill. We must have defense. The point I want to drive home, if possible, is that to my mind we are not getting a dollars' worth of security out of every dollar we are spending. Let us take up the bill and analyze it. It follows the old formula: a third to the Army, a third to the Navy, and a third to the Air Force. Yet, the facts are that the security we need, and the security that those in authority know we must have would be provided by building up our Air Force as the key to our survival. I realize that time is growing short and that we must continue these appropriations, but I should like to see this bill go back to the Appropriations Committee. We should start at the beginning and put first things first. We should put items down as "must" items, and appropriate

for the "must" items first. Then we should fit the rest of the cloth to the pattern of the receipts that flow into the Treasury. In that way we will keep our economy sound. Until we do that we will not get the security we need to protect the war potential of the United States if it is attacked by an enemy.

General Vandenberg said that if the Red Air Force made an all-out attack on the United States of America, 75 percent of their planes would get through. When we think of New York, Chicago, Cleveland, and a half dozen other great industrial centers of the United States, which are only 5½ hours from Russia, by way of the North Pole route, the thing we should be striving for with these huge appropriations is the means by which we can best protect ourselves.

Let us provide the Air Force, which is most needed to defend this country. Let us provide such air power that, if need be, it can go to Russia and bomb her into submission on her own soil. Then let us fit the Army and the Navy to the needs of our country. That is not what we are doing in this bill.

Mr. President, we do not have any assurance of 95 air groups. It is merely a pious hope in the report. All we have authorized is 70 air groups.

Why spend money on foot soldiers? Why spend money on surface ships? Why not spend the money where we get a dollar's worth of security for every dollar we spend? Why not spend it on the kind of security for which we have the manpower available and the kind of security we can pay for?

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. CASE. I hesitate to interrupt the Senator, but I wish to express my appreciation to him for the sentiments he has been expressing. Yesterday afternoon on the floor of the Senate we found how difficult it is to develop a sentiment or attitude which would look toward cutting the appropriations in this bill. That is the point the Senator from Nebraska has been making. Some of us attempted to make that point yesterday afternoon. If a military appropriation bill is to be considered sacrosanct, or as a bill that cannot stand any cuts, there is no hope at all of having sound finances. If the Senator will permit, I have before me a page from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 4, which gives the latest summary of the appropriation bills which have been passed by Congress. It includes all the regular appropriation bills, except the small legislative bill. The total amount is \$14,700,000,000. The total includes the Veterans Administration, the Independent Offices, the Atomic Energy Commission, and Labor and Federal Security. If those appropriations are subtracted, there is left nearly \$7,000,000,000.

It has been said that we might be able to reduce the prospective tax bill by cutting nondefense expenditures. The fact is that if we eliminate entirely appropriations for the Department of the Interior, the Department of Agriculture, the Post Office Department, Treasury Department, and all the regular activi-

ties of the Government, we would save only \$7,000,000,000, except for the Veterans Administration and the Atomic Energy Commission. Therefore, if we want to do anything about reducing the tax bill, we must do it on the big money bill, and that is the bill before the Senate now.

Mr. WHERRY. I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from South Dakota. I say once again that the figures I have given are estimates, of course. Nevertheless, we are appropriating the amount of money I have indicated, though the figures may change somewhat. I believe that any Senator, regardless of his side of the aisle, has a perfect right to offer any amendment to cut any appropriation in this bill, for it is just as important to take waste out of the military appropriations as it is to take it out of civilian appropriations, if waste can be found to exist.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. TAFT. I agree in general with the Senator's predictions as to expenditures. It seems to me that perhaps for this year the estimate is correct. Perhaps we cannot proceed with the program fast enough to spend \$70,000,000,000, and that with the new tax bill the figures will be fairly within reach of one another. However, I agree that the pending bill is inaugurating a program which will cost the Federal Government at least \$90,000,000,000, with at least \$5,000,000,000 being added by the committee, and I agree with the Senator from Nebraska that it may reach \$100,000,000,000.

When we consider the total tax burden of the country, including the \$20,000,000,000 of State and local taxes, we must realize that \$120,000,000,000 in taxes, which would be necessary in order to balance the budget, is practically 45 percent of the entire national income of the American people. I say that perhaps we can balance the budget this year. But how we are still going to get \$3,000,000,000 in taxes on top of the bill which is now being considered, I do not know. I believe that the imposition of such taxes would do more harm than good.

We are undertaking a program, if it is justified—and perhaps it is justified by the emergency—which will certainly lead inevitably to inflation. Regardless of whether and where we find the additional taxes, taxes themselves are inflationary when they get beyond a certain point. Personally, I do not believe we can levy \$75,000,000,000 in taxes, plus local and State taxes. I do not believe we can levy in taxes more than 40 percent of the national income without doing the country harm, without bringing about almost every form of labor difficulty, and without having inflation, no matter what controls may be in force.

It may or may not be necessary to spend this money, but we ought not to spend it without realizing that if we are going to continue such a scale of expenditure, we will plunge the country into economic difficulty. In other words, if we spend more than \$75,000,000,000 a year—I cannot give the exact

figure—we will be deliberately weakening our whole economic structure. Personally I do not believe that we ought to do it in a time of peace. In time of war, we had to do it. The result was inflation of 70 percent and a 40 percent depreciation of the dollar. That happened during the Second World War, and we could not help it. However, in the present emergency the question is whether it is necessary to go that far.

I do not blame the Appropriations Committee; its members have to handle a program to which the entire Government is committed. Yet it seems to me that no one has thus far determined what is the economic limitation, when we are considering a program for perhaps 5, 10, or 20 years. After all, Mr. President, this program is not merely for the duration of the war. I agree with the Senator from Nebraska that following the present program, we shall have a similar program in 1953, and perhaps we shall have a program calling for appropriations of \$100,000,000,000 in 1954. If the appropriations can be tapered off after that, I shall be surprised. I think President Truman is talking nonsense if he thinks the program we shall have 2 years from now can be balanced by taxes without doing infinite harm to the people of the United States.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I certainly thank the Senator from Ohio for his observations. He has expressed most forcefully the sentiments I have attempted to express. He has given us an admonition which I believe all of us should take most seriously to heart in connection with the appropriation bills.

As I said before, it is very difficult for any Senator to vote against a defense bill. And yet, Mr. President, the future holds nothing but terrifically large appropriations, and no one knows what their impact will be. It may be that they will require a completely controlled economy; I simply do not know.

I regret that various of the committees are holding meetings today, for I believe that every Member of the Senate should be on the floor to participate in this debate. If any Member has an amendment which will reduce the size of this appropriation bill, and if he can justify the amendment, I think it should be adopted, regardless of whether the item is military or nonmilitary in nature.

I am not at all disrespectful or critical of the committee. As I stated at the beginning of my remarks, hearings have been held, and a bill in keeping with the wishes of the administration has been reported to the Senate. But I believe the American people should know what we are getting into. This program and these appropriations will not stop this year or next year. In my judgment they will not stop in 1954. It is easy enough for one to voice hopes; but in view of the commitments we have made and in view of the policy we are now pursuing, I think the impact will be terrific and terrible upon the entire country.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I think the Senator's remarks are very timely. Last week I compiled some figures regarding the total tax collections in the United States from its very beginning. I think those figures are apt, in view of the fact that in the next few days we are to consider a new tax bill.

I find that the total tax collections have been as follows: From 1789, in the administration of the first President of the United States, to June 30, 1944, the end of President Roosevelt's administration, a period of 156½ years, the Federal Government collected in taxes and spent \$248,348,394,590.

From May 1, 1945, the beginning of the Truman administration, until June 30, 1951, a period of 6½ years, the Federal Government collected and spent \$260,417,309,430. In other words, in 6½ years the Federal Government spent \$12,000,000,000 more than the Government of the United States had spent in its previous 156½ years. I think it is time for us to stop and think, Mr. President.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Once again, Mr. President, I say that, in my opinion, this is a matter for each Senator to resolve for himself. I am not criticizing. If a Senator thinks we should double the appropriations, such a Senator has a perfect right to offer amendments to that effect and to try to justify them.

On the other hand, a Senator who wishes to cut either a military or a nonmilitary appropriation item should not be criticized for attempting to do so, because I believe it to be the duty of every Senator to try to cut the appropriations to the bone; and, where a cut can be made to eliminate waste, such cuts should be made.

I do not mean that I shall support all proposed cuts. However, if an amendment proposing a cut which I regard as justified is offered, I certainly shall support it, in the hope that by means of such cuts we shall begin to hold the appropriations somewhere within the ability of the people of the United States to pay for them, and at the same time preserve their economy without requiring controls which are so rigid that we defeat the very purpose for which the controls are imposed in the first place.

COLD WAR COSTLY

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I came on the floor while the Senator from Nebraska and the Senator from Ohio were discussing the fiscal dilemma in which the people of the United States find themselves.

I wish to say that I completely agree with the import of what both Senators have said, assuming that I have heard enough of their statements to gather their correct import.

We are spending a tremendous sum of money. We must not close our eyes to the fact that we are engaged in a cold war with a totalitarian tyranny which hopes the free world will wreck itself economically.

I have repeatedly stated my belief, and I now reassert it, that the Soviets do not intend to launch a third world war at this time. They are willing to follow and, indeed, will follow a policy of pro-

moting a series of peripheral wars which they will fight with the soldiers of their satellite and puppet nations. As a matter of fact, in the books which have been written by the leaders of totalitarian communism, statements to that effect have been made. We have been warned by no less a person than Joe Stalin himself that it is not the purpose of the Soviets to throw the Red Russian Army into conflict until the final hour has arrived. It is the purpose of the Communists to sow dissension, confusion, doubt, and despair, if possible, among the peoples of the free world.

Mr. President, in my solemn judgment the greatest duty of American citizens, and particularly of those who at this time occupy positions of responsibility and leadership in this great democracy, is to preserve unity and to consider whether there may be another road down which we may go with greater success than that along which we have been traveling.

BILL CAREFULLY SCRUTINIZED

I am in charge of the pending appropriation bill, which was reported from the committee, carrying approximately \$61,000,000,000 of appropriations. Yesterday I told the Senate how the bill had been scrutinized in the House of Representatives for more than 11 weeks by the members of the House Appropriations Committee, a bipartisan committee composed of both Republicans and Democrats; and when the bill was reported to the floor of the House of Representatives, no minority views were filed. Some reductions were proposed; but an examination of the report submitted to the House of Representatives by the House Appropriations Committee reveals clearly that the Members of the House Appropriations Committee felt, as I think the Members of the Senate Appropriations Committee feel, namely, that they did not wish to substitute their civilian judgment for the military judgment of the men who, in the democratic process, we have charged with the responsibility for handling our military affairs.

I know there are places in this bill where great cuts can be made.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes, I am very glad to yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Where are those places, if the Senator knows?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am going to tell the Senator.

Mr. AIKEN. Is the Senator going to point them out to us?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes, I shall be very glad to do that.

MEETING WITH JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF

Before the subcommittee was called to mark up the bill, I went to the Pentagon Building and requested Secretary Marshall to call a special meeting of the Secretaries and of the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, so that I might talk with them about the impression which had been created upon my mind by the testimony we had received. I pointed out the huge appropriation in the bill for ordnance for the Army, amounting ap-

proximately to \$8,000,000,000. I pointed out the huge appropriation in the bill for the Navy. We are taking out of mothballs vessels which were put in mothballs after World War II, and now we are refitting and remodeling them, repairing them, modernizing them, and putting new ordnance upon them—all at great expense.

When 1,162 vessels were stated by the late Admiral Sherman to be a reasonable and proper American Navy to command the seas, to keep lines of communication open, who am I to say that his judgment was wrong, and that mine should take its place?

I pointed out to the Joint Chiefs of Staff that, in my opinion, we should not allow ourselves to drift into a third world war, with the thought that we could fight that war with the weapons of World War II. I know perfectly well, because I have lived with them, that until World War II began some of the ablest and best officers in the Army would argue persuasively, and almost convincingly, that World War II could not be fought without cavalry. They would say, "Horses are necessary to carry on a war."

In France, when General de Gaulle suggested to the general staff of France that technological and scientific progress had been such and that road development had been such that the French Army ought to build a fleet of tanks, the French general staff said, "No; we have a Maginot line, and we shall depend upon the Maginot line to hold back the invading foe." The general staff was mistaken, and France was overrun because it did not prepare the weapons of the modern age to meet the attack of a modern army equipped with modern weapons.

NO SPECIAL INTERESTS CONSIDERED

So I said to this group that I hoped, and I knew the committee hoped, that it would be the purpose of the Secretaries and Joint Chiefs of Staff to examine carefully every proposal, so as to be sure that we were not giving way to any sentiment concerning what might be considered a vested interest of any branch of the military service, but that we should all realize that we were members of a single team to defend the free world against an enemy which had openly and repeatedly declared that it was engaged in world conquest.

I have said, Mr. President, that we are drifting into world war III. Let anybody who is at all acquainted with what happened in the history of mankind look back over the record of the wars of the past, and he will recognize that since the dawn of civilization there never has been a time when the globe was divided between two great powers that those powers did not go to war.

It is easy for us to think in terms of our traditional habits and our traditional way of life, and to forget the great changes which have taken place before our very eyes as the result of the two great world wars which have been fought in this century. As a result of World War I, the Austro-Hungarian Empire absolutely disappeared from the face of the earth. It had been one of the great powers. Italy, in that war, was revealed

as a second-rate power, if not a third-rate power. France and England were revealed as not having the strength to overcome the ambitions of the Kaiser to rule Europe, without the aid of the great free Republic, the giant of the Western Hemisphere; and so we were drawn into that war.

The debts of that war have not yet been paid. When the depression came, there was still a large war debt unpaid, although this Government made every effort to pay it.

DEBTS OF WORLD WAR II

We then became involved in World War II, and today the debt of this Nation is \$256,000,000,000 because of that war. In 1941, before Pearl Harbor, the total national debt of the United States was less than \$50,000,000,000; it was scarcely \$49,000,000,000. Even then we were arming France and arming Britain; and when we went into the war, Congress debated how large a tax bill to levy, and how much to borrow from the citizenry of the United States through the issuance of bonds. There was a notable discussion, and finally the debt limit of the United States was raised from approximately \$50,000,000,000 to \$75,000,000,000 or \$100,000,000,000. Later it was increased to \$150,000,000,000, then to \$200,000,000,000, and finally to \$300,000,000,000.

All the time Congress, with unanimous voice, was saying, "Borrow, borrow, borrow to fight the war." When the war ended, when the shooting stopped, the national debt of the United States was \$276,000,000,000.

The first act of the Congress after the shooting stopped was to pass a rescission bill. The records will show that Congress passed unanimously a bill repealing some \$60,000,000,000 or \$70,000,000,000 of military appropriations. The chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, Hon. CLARENCE CANNON, of Missouri, was the author of the bill rescinding appropriations which had been made, so that they could not be spent; and the President of the United States, in order to avoid additional debt, gave orders that the \$20,000,000,000 which had been raised by the latest bond issue should be used to pay off the debt rather than for any purpose involving any expenditure whatsoever.

So in 1945, immediately after the shooting stopped, the national debt was reduced by \$20,000,000,000 to about \$256,000,000,000. At that figure it has remained, almost steady, since that day. When the past fiscal year ended, there was a surplus in the Treasury of more than \$3,000,000,000. Expenditures for war and for preparedness for war had not yet begun to eat into that surplus at any great rate.

As a result, on the 1st of July there was a surplus, but in May and June there was a deficit. Because we had such a deficit, and because we are involved in a difficult situation, Congress has enacted two tax bills. In the past session of the Congress a tax bill was enacted, and now the House has passed another, and we are calling upon the people of the United States to make their contributions by way of heavy taxes to help

defray the expenses incurred in carrying out the policies and programs which, by practically unanimous vote, we have undertaken.

INVENTIVE GENIUS OF AMERICAN PEOPLE

I was upon the floor of the Senate when the late Senator Vandenberg, of Michigan, submitted the unanimous report of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate to authorize the Marshall plan, designed to rehabilitate the economy of the impoverished and partially destroyed nations of Europe. Never before in history had a conquering nation taken such a step. Of course, there were many on the floor of the Senate and throughout the country who doubted the advisability of that expenditure.

There were many who said, thoughtfully, "Should we not spend the money at home instead of spending it abroad?" But the arguments were clear that it was the inventive genius of the people of America which has made the world the small globe it is today as compared with what it was when the Members of this body were children; all the great inventions, all the great technological advances which have reduced this globe to such a small size that one can fly in 7 hours from one side of the United States to the other, and even fly around the world in practically no time.

In the United States we have developed speedy engines and intrepid fliers who have penetrated the very sound barrier, flying in a plane faster than the speed of sound. Have Senators ever stood on an airfield and watched one of the jet planes fly past and heard long after the plane had passed the explosion that took place before their eyes as it was passing? If they have, they realize what science has done.

The people of the United States who were so productive are the ones who have voluntarily taken upon themselves the leadership destiny has placed upon their shoulders. We are the one great power that remains in the world competent to defend freedom. The only other great power in the world is devoted, confessedly and boastfully devoted, to the destruction of freedom of the individual.

AMERICA IN DILEMMA

Does that mean we are going to have another war? Are we going to continue to make huge appropriations like those authorized in the pending bill, as the Senator from Nebraska inquired? If we are to continue, then, indeed, we run the risk of having here the same totalitarianism against which we are trying to defend mankind.

We are in this great dilemma. We know that the Soviets do not have to depend upon the will or the cooperation of the individuals who constitute the population of Russia. They do not have to depend upon the voluntary cooperation of the satellite peoples, because a dictatorship of the proletariat invades a nation and crushes out all opposition. It banishes to a concentration camp those who dare to express an opinion contrary to that which the will of the dictator is willing to permit.

The Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] stood upon the Senate floor a few

days ago and delivered a moving talk about what has been going on in Hungary, the deportation of the people so that all dissent may be wiped out. Russia does not have to depend upon the productive capacity of a free people. It depends upon the productive capacity of a slave people. Such a people and such a capacity we do not have in the United States.

So the policy of this Government, as I read it, and as I have listened to it being described by men of both parties, is that we shall not now put our foot upon the path of revenge, destruction, or exploitation of nations or peoples anywhere, but shall seek only to share with all mankind the basic freedoms which we claimed for ourselves when the Declaration of Independence was written and when the Constitution of the United States was drafted.

OPPORTUNITY FOR AMERICA

A great opportunity is granted us to hold before the peoples of the world the torch of human freedom. That is what our Government is trying to do. That is the explanation of the policy of containment against Russia. It is the explanation of the Marshall plan; it is the explanation of the Japanese treaty. While there may have been failings, while it is possible to pick flaws in every human instrument and every human policy, the fact remains that as a result of what we have done, Europe is much better off now than it was even before the war began.

Mr. President, I think our problem is to show the peoples of the world, by example, what a free and democratic people can do by cooperation. Nothing is to be gained by dissension among ourselves, by attacks one upon the other, but everything is to be gained if only we have the courage and the will and the foresight to stand together in unity.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. The Senator is making a very admirable address. I wonder if he would agree that if the time ever comes when a rearméd Japan and Germany would take their place in a system of mutual collective security along with the other free nations of the world, we could feel then that we had reached the point where we should be relatively safe from the threat of aggression with which we have been confronted in the past few years.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think that is possible. But I believe it is to be achieved here among ourselves. It is not by the appropriation of dollars that we are going to triumph over this unfortunate situation. It is by the living spirit and the divine spark in the will of every man and woman in America.

Mr. LONG. I thank the Senator.

SACRIFICES REQUIRED

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is the answer. It is by our willingness now to make at home the sacrifices which are necessary to enable us to show the people of all the world that we are interested in nothing but freedom and advancement for people everywhere. That is the answer.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. LONG. In line with the Senator's argument, it is important that we all realize that at this stage of history this Nation is the only one great enough and strong enough to carry the burden. That is the reason why we are having to make tremendous sacrifices now.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is so true that it ought to be written in words of fire across the wall of every home in America. We cannot hope to escape from our present dilemma except by following a course of action, as the patriots who founded America did, marked by a readiness to serve and a readiness to sacrifice.

Mr. LONG. I thank the Senator.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I hesitate to say what is in my heart, but it is there. The great opportunity for the people of America is in devotion to the Christian ideal. If we are capable of doing at home the things which we know to be right, and if we have the courage to forego the pettiness of unnecessary conflict, and give the world a picture of a united America, then, Mr. President, I think we can save our economy and we can save our freedom, and we can lead the world to the freedom which we wish for all people everywhere.

Mr. President, I say these few words, all too long, more than I had intended to say when I rose, because I want every Member of the Senate to know that I do not regard the dollars in this bill as sacrosanct.

SEVERE CUTS MADE

I do not intend to say that the amounts may not be reduced. But I want every Member of the Senate to know that men of good faith, men of patriotism built this budget, that men in the Department of Defense are just as eager as anybody on this floor to save the taxpayer's dollar. I know, because I have been in intimate contact with them, that time after time the Comptroller of the Department of Defense and the Deputy Secretary, Mr. Lovett, on whom the responsibility of the budget depended, have cut and cut and cut, and their cutting was so severe and so broad that when the bill went to the floor of the House there were no additional cuts made there beyond those made by the committee.

Mr. McMAHON and Mr. SCHOEPPPEL rose.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I first yield to the Senator from Connecticut, after which I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. McMAHON. In line with what the Senator has just said about Mr. Lovett's stewardship of the budget, I think it might be well at this point to have in the RECORD a quotation from the report of the Senator's committee, the Committee on Appropriations:

Attention is called to the fact that, as testified by Under Secretary Robert A. Lovett at the opening session of the committee hearings, the original requests of the various military forces for appropriations totaled \$104,000,000,000 and the Office of the Secretary of Defense, by rigid scrutiny of these requests, reduced the total budget to \$62,105,000,000 including \$4,500,000,000 for pub-

lic works for which no specific appropriations were contained in the bill as it passed the House.

I thought I would call that to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. President, when the proper time comes I assume that we will resume consideration of the bill. I was prompted to make these remarks by what the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] said. I welcome, of course, any considered amendments which may be offered to the bill.

LONG CONSIDERATION BY COMMITTEE

But I desire it to be clearly understood that the Senate Subcommittee on Military Appropriations sat continuously from the 7th of June until the 28th of August, that it made a searching examination of this entire budget, and that no amendment was presented and no proposal was made to the subcommittee by any Member of the Senate during all that period. The subcommittee acted in its best judgment with the evidence before it. It received testimony from everyone who asked permission to come before it. What it presents to the Senate is its best judgment of what the crisis of our time requires.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL and Mr. MAYBANK rose.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I yield first to the Senator from Kansas, who was on his feet when I yielded to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. I should like to suggest to the Senator from Wyoming that when he made reference to the fact that the requests had been cut, he probably referred to the House committee. Can the Senator enlighten the Senate today as to what the initial over-all requests were, and actually how much they were cut?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes. As I said yesterday, and as appears in the budget, the various military establishments, when they were submitting their estimates to the Secretary of Defense for the preparation of the budget, asked for \$104,000,000,000. The Department of Defense cut those estimates back to \$60,000,000,000. The total appropriations for 1951 amounted to \$48,205,247,443. The budget estimates which came to us, exclusive of the four and one-half billion for public works, amounted to \$57,679,625,700. The House allowed \$56,034,717,200, and the Senate committee, by adding \$5,000,000,000 for the expansion of air power, and making a few increases which the evidence seemed to indicate were absolutely essential, increased the bill to the amount now recommended for the consideration of the Senate, \$61,103,856,030.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

EARLY START OF HEARINGS

Mr. MAYBANK. I ask the Senator from Wyoming if it is not a fact that he was so concerned about the large amount of money which had been requested in the budget that he determined to commence hearings even before the bill had passed the House.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. We began our hearings on June 7. The bill did not pass the House until August 9.

Mr. MAYBANK. As chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Wyoming felt that a thorough investigation into every item should be made. While it was not my privilege to be with him at all the hearings, I was present whenever I could be there. I have never seen a more thorough study by a subcommittee of an appropriation bill since I have been a member of the committee, since 1941, than was made from June 7 until last week, when the subcommittee met to report the bill to the full committee.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator from South Carolina.

TAXATION OF FARMERS' COOPERATIVES

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, there seems to be considerable confusion and misunderstanding as to what was embodied in yesterday's decision of the Senate Finance Committee in rejecting the so-called Williams proposal to correct certain tax inequities as related to cooperatives.

In order to keep the record straight, I shall outline exactly what is embodied in my proposal which the Senate Finance Committee rejected and also that which is embodied in the Kerr proposal which has been accepted by the Finance Committee.

The rejected proposal, which had been designated as the Williams proposal and which was rejected by a vote of 7 to 6 in the committee, provided:

First. That any portion of a cooperative's earning which were distributed to its members in cash or merchandise within 75 days after the close of their fiscal year would be completely tax exempt to the cooperative.

Second. My proposal was modified to provide that producer cooperatives such as milk producers associations, mushroom growers, and cotton farmers, should be allowed to set up a 5-year revolving fund allocating the earnings in each year to the members payable in irrevocable certificates with maturity dates not exceeding 5 years, and still retain complete tax exemption. In each instance the distribution described above in paragraphs 1 and 2 would be taxable to the farmers but not taxable to the cooperative.

Third. As to the remainder, that is, that portion of the cooperative's earnings which were not distributed as outlined above, but which were withheld by the cooperative and merely allocated to the farmers in the form of scrip, stock, letters of credit, or other types of certificates, the cooperative would pay the regular corporation tax. Under this proposal, it was provided that on the part of earnings on which the cooperative paid corporation tax, there would be no tax to the farmers.

While the farmers would be taxable on all payments received by them in either cash or merchandise, they would not be taxable on those earnings which were retained by the cooperative and upon which the cooperative paid taxes as described in paragraph 3.

This proposal specifically spelled out that there would be no double taxation but that in each instance the taxes would be paid either by the farmer or the cooperative, whichever received or retained the money. If, subsequently, the earnings which were retained by the cooperative and upon which the cooperative had paid the regular corporation taxes were distributed to the farmer, such distribution would be tax-exempt to the farmers, thereby making certain that there would be no double taxation.

This proposal, which represented a modification of the Treasury Department recommendations, was rejected by a vote of 7 to 6. I voted for the above-outlined proposal and still feel that while it was not the perfect answer, it would have been a major step toward correcting the recognized inequities as related to competitive business enterprises and at the same time, it would have not only reduced tax liability of the individual farmers but also would have provided a greater security and protection for the American farmers.

Instead of accepting this proposal, the Senate Finance Committee adopted the Kerr proposal which, in my opinion, places both the farmer and small-business man in a worse position than ever before. Instead of diminishing the competitive advantages which these cooperatives have over private industry, it actually increases and encourages the tax-exempt advantages of the super-cooperatives by incorporating into the law numerous exemptions and privileges which previously were recognized only by Treasury regulations. The Kerr proposal now states that it is the intention of Congress that all cooperatives should be privileged to enjoy 100 percent tax exemption through the medium of either bona fide or phony allocations to the farmers. Under the Kerr proposal, any cooperative can discharge itself of all income-tax liability as a corporation by merely allocating its earnings to its individual members. Such allocations are to be recognized as legitimate deductions and not taxable to the cooperative, but fully taxable to the farmer. Even though they are marked payable 50 to 100 years hence, or marked payable only upon liquidation of the corporation, or at any other indefinite period, solely at the discretion of the board of directors, they will still exempt the cooperative from tax liability.

These certificates of indebtedness, letters of credit, scrip, or any other form of allocation need not be negotiable pieces of paper, nor do they have to bear any interest rates. Yet, in each instance it is spelled out under the committee action that these certificates of allocation must be recognized as cash contributions to the farmers and thereby must be included in their tax returns during the year in which such allocations are made.

Apparently operating upon the theory that the farmers cannot be trusted and to facilitate the collection of Federal income taxes not only on the bona fide allocations, but also on phony allocations which read "payable some time in the indefinite future" the committee under

the Kerr proposal has incorporated a provision instructing the Secretary of the Treasury to demand from the cooperatives a list of all such allocations, along with the names and addresses of the farmers to whom they are allocated. They do not mind these large co-ops going tax-exempt, but they are going to be sure to collect the tax from the farmer. The fact that, in many instances, farmers will be forced to borrow money to pay tax on long-term allocations does not in the least concern those who supported this provision.

The committee boasts of the fact that it is providing a corporation tax on all unallocated earnings of the cooperative, and calls this plugging a loophole. That is a completely false claim, because under the Kerr proposal any cooperative can divest itself of complete tax liability by merely increasing allocations to the farmers. This would shift the tax from the cooperative to the farmers. I voted against the so-called Kerr proposal which was adopted by the committee, and I denounce it as a complete sell-out of both the American farmer and the small-business man each of whose taxes are being raised as much as 20 percent under this same bill.

It is no doubt true that yesterday's action of the Finance Committee will be hailed as a great victory by the super co-ops. It should be. They practically wrote the language of the amendment.

Let no one mislead Senators into believing that the co-ops who put on the drive against this tax proposal are small farmers. As evidence of their size, I call attention to a few of those who have led the fight. The examples are taken from testimony given before the Ways and Means Committee of the House in 1948.

CALIFORNIA FRUIT GROWERS EXCHANGE, LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

This cooperative has an annual estimated business volume in excess of \$300,000,000. It operates three subsidiaries, the Exchange Orange Products Co., the Exchange Lemon Products Co., and the Fruit Growers Supply Co., through which they market more than 85 percent of all the lemons and over 33 percent of all the oranges in the United States.

In addition to practically controlling the citrus-fruit markets of the United States, this same cooperative owns 100,000 acres of timberland. They operate three lumber mills and they own the entire town of Westwood, Calif., including the telephone, water, electric, and sewerage systems of that town which they purchased from the Red River Lumber Co. in 1944 at an estimated price of \$11,000,000. Also included in the purchase of the town was a railroad.

This same Red River Lumber Co. had paid, in the year prior to their purchase by this cooperative, nearly \$1,000,000 in Federal income taxes, revenue which henceforth will be lost to the Federal Treasury. It should be re-emphasized here that every time a tax-paying private enterprise is absorbed by a cooperative those who will remain

in private industry must make up the deficit.

NATIONAL FARM MACHINERY COOPERATIVE,
BELLEVUE, OHIO

This cooperative was organized in April 1940, largely through the efforts of the Indiana Farm Bureau Corp. They reported a business volume for the year ending June 1946 of more than \$3,000,000. At the same time they announced that they expected to reach a volume of business in 1947-48 of approximately \$19,000,000.

Shortly after its organization this cooperative purchased the Ohio Cultivator Co., which is now operated as one of their divisions. In the year prior to their absorption by this cooperative the Ohio Cultivator Co., operating as a private company, paid income tax of \$197,000. As previously mentioned in similar cases, this revenue is now lost to the Treasury Department for as long a period as cooperatives enjoy the present tax exemption.

THE SOUTHERN STATES COOPERATIVE, INC.,
RICHMOND, VA.

This cooperative was originally organized in 1923 as the Virginia Seed Service.

It was reorganized in 1933 under its present name, with total assets of only \$191,692.01.

Up to 1946 it is reported as servicing 200,000 patrons in Virginia, Delaware, Kentucky, Maryland, and West Virginia. It is composed of 7 subsidiary corporations, 80 cooperative retail-service stores, 3 cooperative freezer-locker plants, 17 petroleum cooperatives, and 3 marketing cooperatives. It also operates three fertilizer plants—one in Norfolk and two in Baltimore—and it is understood others are soon to be constructed in Nashville, Tenn.; Winchester, Ky.; and Bowling Green, Ky.

In addition to distributing farm supplies through its own retail outlets, the Southern States Cooperative also sells through 59 independent local cooperative associations and some 484 private dealer agencies. The supplies consist of feed, fertilizer, seed, petroleum, and farm supplies.

The following table shows the dollar volume, net earnings, total assets, and net worth of Southern States Cooperative for the 10-year period 1938 to 1947, inclusive:

	Dollar value	Net earnings	Total assets	Net worth
1938.....	\$7,949,829.91	\$177,185.53	\$2,419,636.76	\$1,026,278.88
1939.....	7,868,899.75	433,483.27	2,771,207.90	1,303,955.32
1940.....	10,168,855.76	590,097.64	3,165,858.48	1,403,633.77
1941.....	11,513,995.19	581,201.22	4,169,589.56	2,098,083.91
1942.....	17,723,696.23	1,093,795.45	6,491,625.78	3,275,699.31
1943.....	27,503,932.87	1,596,689.88	7,343,119.82	4,682,808.74
1944.....	40,130,581.02	2,719,067.66	8,911,887.29	6,915,234.38
1945.....	40,459,448.01	1,312,241.63	9,703,300.14	8,687,127.83
1946.....	41,939,193.02	1,392,916.44	12,685,968.62	11,430,945.38
1947.....	53,162,125.85	1,512,161.66	19,449,279.40	13,988,002.21

As this table shows, during this 10-year period Southern States' assets increased from \$2,419,636.76 to \$19,449,279.40, or more than 8 times in this brief period of time. Its net worth grew from \$1,026,278.88 to \$13,988,002.21, or more than 13 times. The reason Southern States made this extraordinary record is by virtue of its tax exemption. It today enjoys a 38-percent tax advantage over private enterprise.

FARMERS' UNION GRAIN TERMINAL ASSOCIATION,
ST. PAUL, MINN.

This cooperative was incorporated in 1938 with a capitalization of \$30,000, and by 1946 their net worth had increased to \$10,680,000.

The cooperative owns six terminal elevators. One of these elevators is located at Superior, Wis., with a capacity of 4,500,000 bushels.

The cooperative, through its subsidiary, Farmers' Lumber & Supply Co., now operates 75 lumber yards and 54 coal yards, located throughout 6 States.

It now handles more than 100,000,000 bushels of grain a year.

Through another affiliate, Farmers' Union Grain & Supply Co., it manufactures feed, processes poultry, operates a locker plant, and handles farm supplies for distribution.

In 1946 it showed net earnings of \$3,650,000, upon which an ordinary corporation would have paid Federal income taxes of nearly \$1,400,000.

This cooperative does not distribute patronage dividends in cash but in stocks

and certificates of equity. Through this method, this cooperative has been able to capitalize its rapid expansion almost entirely out of tax-exempt earnings.

The ninth annual report of this cooperative, 1946, shows that—

If the net savings for the year ending on May 31, 1946, had been paid out in cash refunds, this is what your GTA could not have done:

GTA could not have increased its liquid capital, \$864,399.54.

GTA could not have paid off the mortgage debt, \$1,249,650.

GTA could not have purchased additional properties, \$817,700.

CONSUMERS' COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION, INC.,
NORTH KANSAS CITY, MO.

The Consumers' Cooperative Association was incorporated in 1929 with seven members and a capitalization of \$3,000. In 1946, 17 years later, the invested capital was listed at \$9,614,557.15, an increase of more than 3,000 percent.

It owns a soybean mill, a cannery, a cola bottling plant, an oil compounding plant, a printing plant, a feed mill, an alfalfa dehydrating plant, and 11 warehouses.

In 1939 it organized a subsidiary cooperative, Cooperative Refinery Association, Phillipsburg, Kans., to build and operate an oil refinery with a rated capacity of 3,400 barrels daily. In 1942 they purchased a 1,500-barrel refinery of the Terry Carpenter, Inc., at a cost of \$700,000. One year later the 13,500-barrel refinery at Coffeyville, Kans., was

purchased from the National Refinery Co. for \$4,000,000. In 1943 this cooperative joined with the Central Cooperative Wholesale of Superior, Wis., the Midland Cooperative Wholesale of Minneapolis, Minn., the Farmers Union Central Exchange of St. Paul, Minn., and the Farmers Union State Exchange of Omaha, Nebr., and organized the National Cooperative Refinery Association with an authorized capital of \$2,010,000. This newly organized cooperative then purchased the 17,500-barrel refinery of the Globe Oil & Refining Co. at an estimated cost of \$5,000,000. Prior to 1943 the Globe Oil and Refining Co., which they purchased, had been paying Federal income taxes for the previous 11 years. Included in this purchase was a 229-mile pipe line from McPherson, Kans., to Council Bluffs, Iowa. They own and operate 1,000 miles of pipe line. At the end of 1946 they were pumping 448 oil wells.

In 1946 the Consumers Cooperative Association sales volume equaled \$26,243,652.71; earnings for this same year were reported at \$1,665,298.82.

The manager of this giant cooperative has been given the credit for coining the phrase "factories are free to cooperatives."

The operations of this giant cooperative had reached such staggering proportions and had drifted so far from the original concept of a farmer cooperative that last year Hon. Edward F. Arn, the attorney general for the State of Kansas, thought it necessary to instigate a suit asking for the dissolution of this giant cooperative, which, using his own terms, was characterized as an "industrial empire." The suit asked for the dissolution and charged them with violating State marketing act and the sale of \$7,000,000 unregistered securities in violation of the laws of Kansas.

The attorney general also pointed out that this giant cooperative which was operating under the immunity which Congress had originally intended for the benefit of small farmers only, had extended their operations in international trade and that such sales included 3,000,000 gallons of motor oil exported to 10 foreign countries during the year 1946.

The net result of the gradual accumulation by this giant cooperative of these various once privately owned enterprises meant the gradual reduction of the number of taxpayers who were carrying the load of our Government expenditures.

In the bulletin published by the Farm Credit Administration entitled "Handbook on Major Regional Farm Supply Purchasing Cooperatives, 1944 and 1945," the following statement was contained in reference to this same corporation:

Of the net worth as of August 31, 1945, 19 percent was accumulated through sale of stock and 81 percent represented retained savings.

These are not small farmers. They represent big business. According to a recent bulletin published by the Treasury Department it shows that out of a total of 2,909 cooperatives examined, 7 of this number had assets ranging from ten to fifty million dollars each and that com-

bined they accounted for 20 percent of all the assets of the cooperative corporations.

Sixty-seven of these cooperatives examined accounted for nearly 55 percent of all assets. Under this same chart published by the Treasury Department, it is noted that over 75 percent of the cooperatives examined had assets of less than \$100,000 and thereby have been wholly exempt from any change in the tax status under the previous committee proposal.

All of these small cooperatives are under the Kerr proposal as adopted yesterday by the Senate Finance Committee now subjected to the same treatment as the super co-ops.

It is significant that practically all the objections raised to the Treasury Department's recommendations, as previously approved by the Committee on Finance, came from the large super co-ops. The reason for this is that the small cooperatives were not affected one iota by the first committee action, but they are seriously and adversely affected by the Kerr proposal, as adopted yesterday.

All the super organizations, under the Kerr proposal, will continue to enjoy their special tax exemption. More and more private businesses will continue to be purchased and taken over by these co-ops, and more and more farmers will be burdened with heavier taxes. All because the members of the Senate Finance Committee did not have the intestinal fortitude to correct that which both the committee and the Treasury Department recognized as recently as August 29, 1951, as an inequity in the existing law.

To those who would defend this action on the basis that for 35 years this group has been exempt from taxes and therefore should continue to be exempt, I call attention to certain facts which apparently they have overlooked:

First. Thirty-five years ago, when this exemption was first authorized, our national budget was only \$734,000,000; today it approaches \$100,000,000,000.

Second. Thirty-five years ago our national debt was less than \$1,250,000,000, or \$12 per capita; today it exceeds \$256,000,000,000, or about \$1,700 for every man, woman, and child in America.

Third. Thirty-five years ago we had a long record of balanced budgets; today we have the record of only three balanced budgets during the past 20 years, and this year's prospective deficit approaches an all-time high.

Fourth. Thirty-five years ago the total annual expenditures of our Government were only \$739,000,000. Today the interest charges on our national debt alone amount to more than \$6,000,000,000. In 1916 the charges on our national debt were less than \$23,000,000.

Fifth. Thirty-five years ago no one ever dreamed of taxes on farm machinery, or household articles; today every item is taxed.

Sixth. Thirty-five years ago no one ever heard of a payroll tax; today a deduction is taken from every salaried man's pay envelope.

Seventh. Thirty-five years ago, when this exemption was first granted to the

co-operative corporations, the corporation tax rate was about 2 percent; today it is 52 percent, and with the excess-profits tax the total can advance as high as 69 percent.

Eighth. Thirty-five years ago, when these allocations were listed as taxable to the farmers, instead of to the cooperatives, the farmers had a family deduction of \$4,000 and the tax rate was only 2 percent. Today the farmers' exemption is only \$1,200 and the tax rate of the average farmer runs from 20 to 50 percent.

Ninth. Thirty-five years ago, or even 10 years ago, no one ever dreamed that a tax would be proposed on vacuum cleaners, washing machines, baby creams, baby carriages, electric irons, and other essentials of the home; but today all are being taxed. These items are not luxuries. Anyone who thinks they are should ask his wife. How can any committee defend a tax on these essential items, while at the same time in the name of political expediency it endorses a continuation of tax exemptions for these multimillion dollar organizations?

No one likes high taxes, but all of us recognize that under the existing emergency we are faced with heavy military expenditures and correspondingly high tax rates. The least we can do is divide this load as fairly as possible among all groups. The fact that tax exemptions to certain groups could be justified when the tax rates were but a fraction of today's tax rates cannot be used as a basis for the complete exemption of those groups from taxes today.

These taxes can and should be equalized among all segments of our society.

To attack all who propose placing a portion of this tax on cooperatives as being anti-co-operative is just as unrealistic as to charge all who propose a tax on vacuum cleaners and washing machines as being anti-American housewife, or to charge those who propose an increase in the taxes on private corporations as being anti-our private enterprise system.

Mr. President, I want the American housewives, the small businessmen, and the American farmers, whose personal tax bills are going to be substantially increased under the new tax bill, to know that a major part of their tax increase will go to pay for the free ride of these tax-exempt organizations.

Political expediency may dictate yesterday's action of the Senate Finance Committee in accepting the Kerr proposal, but it most certainly cannot be justified on the basis that it reduces the tax load of the individual farmers or that it protects the competitive position of the small-business man or that it preserves the free enterprise system upon which this country was founded.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5054) making appropriations for the National Security Council, the National Security Resources Board, and for military functions administered by the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

Mr. DOUGLAS obtained the floor.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, if the Senator from Illinois expects to submit amendments at this time, I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I desire to submit an amendment on page 35. I send it to the desk and ask that it be considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. At this time the committee amendments are first in order.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thought all the committee amendments had been approved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Several committee amendments were passed over yesterday, and they must be considered before other amendments are considered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What is the first committee amendment to be considered by the Senate, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending committee amendment is the one on page 3, line 15. It is one of the committee amendments which were passed over on yesterday.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, if the Senator from Illinois will permit, I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum has been suggested, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	McMahon
Bennett	Hendrickson	Millikin
Benton	Hennings	Monroney
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Moody
Bricker	Hill	Morse
Bridges	Hoey	Mundt
Butler, Md.	Holland	Murray
Butler, Nebr.	Humphrey	Neely
Byrd	Hunt	Nixon
Cain	Ives	O'Connor
Capehart	Jenner	O'Mahoney
Carlson	Johnson, Colo.	Pastore
Case	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Clements	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Connally	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Cordon	Kem	Schoeppel
Douglas	Kerr	Smathers
Duff	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Dworshak	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Eastland	Langer	Smith, N. C.
Eaton	Lehman	Stennis
Ellender	Long	Taft
Ferguson	Malone	Thye
Flanders	Martin	Underwood
Frear	Maybank	Watkins
Fulbright	McCarthy	Wherry
George	McClellan	Williams
Gillette	McFarland	Young
Green	McKellar	

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business in connection with their attendance at the conference for the signing of the Japanese Peace Treaty at San Francisco, Calif.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 3, line 15. The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I wish to address myself to the bill for a very few minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I propose at the proper time to make a motion to return the pending bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to the committee to reconsider the bill and to cut the appropriations, in the aggregate amount, to a sum which shall not exceed \$55,000,000,000. The motion is intended to provide that in making this reduction in our military appropriation the committee shall consult with the Secretary of Defense in allocating and apportioning the various amounts between the various branches of the armed services and between the various titles in the bill; and shall consult also with such other advisers as the committee thinks wise in making these allocations and apportionments. The effect of the motion, if carried, Mr. President, is intended to establish a ceiling of \$55,000,000,000 on our military appropriations at this time, this sum to be divided and allocated as the Committee on Appropriations shall think best after consulting the Secretary of Defense and such other advisers as the committee desires to consult.

I am led to make this motion by very serious and fundamental considerations, some of which have been borne on me with especial strength as a member of the Finance Committee, which is endeavoring to place tax burdens on the people of our country as heavy as they can bear with a minimum of inequity and with minimum provisions for retaining our social and political institutions unimpaired. That task I find to be a hopeless one if we are to come anywhere near getting our present defense costs by taxation. If we do not meet them by taxation we thereby subject ourselves increasingly to a more rapid extension of the inflation from which we are already suffering. Frankly, Mr. President, I find the situation appalling.

From the standpoint of our social, economic, and political institutions we are having our initial experience with the garrison state, in which the conduct of our lives is made secondary to the demands of the Military Establishment. The Military Establishment is, at this moment, in the saddle. It has effectual control of our fiscal machinery, of our diplomacy, and of our economic development.

The worst thing about this situation is that in the nature of the case there is no termination or leveling off of the demands of our Military Establishment. This will be denied, and the denials will be honestly made. But in the nature of

the case when a nation places its reliance, as we are doing, completely on military strength, there can be no limit to the defense requirements. One has only to remember the history of the expenditure proposals made during the current calendar year to see the way in which they expand and expand and expand.

Should our State Department cease to be committed so completely to armed force in its policies and should it show energy, initiative, and imagination in performing its proper duties in the field of psychological and spiritual forces, we would cease to be completely dependent on military strength and could bring our expenditures in that field within limits which we could safely carry without dangerous inflation or the serious weakening of our social and economic system.

As to what those unexploited diplomatic resources are, I can only modestly suggest that a statement of purpose as to the ending of the war in Korea such as was proposed in my speech on the Senate floor on July 9 would make it very difficult indeed for the North Koreans or the Chinese to carry on the present conflict with any sympathetic support from any nations in the world whatsoever who are not devoted to aggression and expansion.

As to the threats against the western nations of Europe, it can be said confidently that no conclusion can be reached against the enormous reservoir of manpower in Russia and China by military means alone. No peace can be reached except by making friends and allies of the enslaved subjects of the governments with whom we would find ourselves in conflict. For the most part, our endeavors through the Voice of America and otherwise have been to justify our position to these people. It must now take a new course. We must seek their confidence and their support as allies. We must express our determination in the event of outbreak of war to free them from slavery and seek their participation in gaining their own freedom when this time comes. We must say this openly, firmly, unreservedly, and continuously. The open offensive must begin and begin now.

As is proper, these diplomatic considerations must to some extent determine military policy instead of having the determination go in reverse as now seems to be the case. Any ill-considered, hasty use of the atom bomb would destroy the mutual confidence between ourselves and the enslaved peoples whom we wish to make our allies. Peace would then become impossible. We must reserve the use of the atom bomb for military objectives only and where populations are endangered, the people must have ample warning. Fortunately the more recent developments in atomic warfare seem to make these policies possible where they did not seem so a year or two ago.

Mr. President, we must cut down our expenditures. We must wage a more successful contest with the Politburo. We can do both. If the proposals in my motion are backed up by appropriate action by our State Department we will do both.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one question?

Mr. FLANDERS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CAIN. Would the distinguished Senator from Vermont resist the use of the atomic bomb as a tactical weapon if an overwhelming enemy offensive is shortly to be launched against the allied forces in Korea?

Mr. FLANDERS. I express the belief which I have been led to by news reports and not by inside information, that the development of the atomic weapon as a tactical weapon is well under way, and I see no objection to its use as a tactical weapon. But we would lose any chance of world peace if we use it as a weapon of mass destruction of populations.

Mr. CAIN. I thank the Senator for his reply. May I call to his attention that it was some 4 or 5 months ago that the Senator from Washington introduced into the RECORD a very thoughtful article by Maj. Gen. James Gavin of the Defense Establishment on the question: "How Shall the Atomic Bomb Be Used and Properly Employed as a Tactical Weapon?" General Gavin was in support of such use, and I know the Senator from Vermont will find that article provocative if time permits him to study it.

Mr. FLANDERS. I thank the Senator. I shall look at it with interest.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the amendment which begins on line 17 of page 55 was passed over yesterday at the request of several Senators, in order that the subcommittee chairman, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], might confer with officials within the Defense Establishment so that the Senate might be possessed of a broader information. My understanding is that the Senator from Wyoming now has that information, and I wonder if he would like to offer it at this time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will say to the Senator from Washington that we have not reached that amendment. Several other committee amendments were passed over yesterday.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I have no objection to answering the question of the Senator at this time. But, of course, it would be in proper order if we waited until the amendment was reached.

Mr. CAIN. Many of us are interested in this item, but if it would better serve the purpose of the Senator from Wyoming and the Senate to come to the question at a later hour, that would be most agreeable to me.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have no objection to finishing it immediately, if that is the desire, and since the Senator from Washington is on his feet, why not let us do it now?

The amendment referred to appears on page 55, beginning in line 17.

Mr. CAIN. Yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is the deletion by the Committee on Appropriations of the so-called Van Zandt amendment, which was an amendment offered upon the floor of the House of Representatives. As I explained yesterday at some length, the committee was impelled to delete this amendment because of the persuasive testimony which was pre-

sented by all the armed services that if the rotation policy were not followed out it would upset the rotation program and seriously impair national defense, the security of the country. The committee, however, recognizing the importance of not compelling reservists who have served overseas to serve longer than 12 months, if possible, in active service in Korea particularly, added this paragraph in the report:

The committee strongly feels that the plans of the armed services should be coordinated with the provisions of the Universal Military Training Act and that inactive and volunteer reservists of prior war service should be discharged as soon as possible consistent with defense needs. Short of all-out global war the committee does not expect any branch of the armed services to call any more men involuntarily into service who have had 12 months' service during World War II.

The Senator from Washington in a lengthy colloquy with the chairman of the subcommittee yesterday asked several questions with respect to what the likelihood would be of the Department of Defense carrying out this policy. He asked me if I would get in touch with the Department of Defense and procure a response. That I have done. I hold in my hand a memorandum furnished by Brigadier General Moore, which is a summary of three statements from each of the armed services, copies of which I handed to the Senator from Washington, which he now has. The summary which the Senator from Washington and I read together—it is dated September 11, and is a memorandum for my information and for the information of the Senate—reads as follows:

MEMORANDUM FOR SENATOR O'MAHONEY
SEPTEMBER 11, 1951.

1. Will the Department of Defense cancel pending orders to report for duty pertaining to those inactive and involuntary organized reservists personnel serving 12 months in World War II?

2. Hereafter will the Department agree that they will not call any more inactive or involuntary organized reservists who served 12 months in World War II?

I consulted with Secretary Rosenberg regarding the above two questions and she, in turn, consulted with the services. I am afraid that these questions reflect a misunderstanding of, or lack of clarity in, Defense's position.

In essence, the Department of Defense position is as follows:

1. The Department is releasing volunteer and inactive (nonpay status) inactive reservists as fast as it possibly can without (a) abandoning rotation plans; (b) endangering the combat effectiveness of the services; (c) calling up large numbers of additional volunteer and inactive (nonpay status) reservists and breaking up trained reserve units and using the men as individual replacements.

2. The Department is making every effort to minimize further recalls of volunteer inactive reservists.

(a) Enlisted men in this category: The Army is making no calls on these men; the Air Force is making no calls on these men; the Navy expects to stop calling such men by January 1, 1952; the Marine Corps has virtually exhausted such men.

(b) Officers in this category: The Army is not now issuing active-duty orders to men in this category but may have to do so in the future; the Air Force will only call such men as are absolutely essential for opera-

tions, predominantly combat crews requiring long training periods; the Navy has a continuing need for such officers but will minimize its calls to the maximum extent; the Marine Corps has virtually exhausted this category.

(c) Mrs. Rosenberg is developing a coordinated program to screen any future plans for recalls, from the viewpoint of need, utilization, and alternate sources.

(d) Training programs for replacement personnel have been accelerated to the maximum but the flow does not yet meet urgent immediate requirements. The services strongly warn against any further inflexible restriction on the recall of reserves.

Attached are the categorical answers of the services.

I do not know that it is necessary to read the categorical answers. I shall be glad to ask that they be inserted in the RECORD at this point in further amplification of the summary prepared by General Moore. Let me say that these are the considerations which moved the committee to recommend the deletion of the amendment. In the summary the reasons are these:

The Department of Defense is promoting a rotation program by which it is hoped to have at least 100,000 men back from Korea by December; by which it is hoped to release from active duty those men who served during last winter in Korea; and by which, in accomplishing that purpose, the military effectiveness of our armed services in Korea shall not be impaired. Our feeling was that to write this amendment or any modification of the amendment into the bill would introduce a degree of inflexibility which would not be in the public interest, and which would not be in the interest of reservists themselves.

Mr. CAIN. I think the Senator from Wyoming evidenced a willingness to have inserted in the RECORD at this point the individual memoranda from the three services.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes. They will be furnished for the RECORD, unless upon examination we find restricted information in them. I doubt that, but I shall be very glad to consult with the Senator.

Mr. CAIN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. O'MAHONEY subsequently said: Mr. President, I find that there is no restricted information in the individual memoranda from the three services, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the memoranda were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM FOR THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE (MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL)

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
BUREAU OF NAVAL PERSONNEL,

Washington, D. C., September 11, 1951.

Subject: Senator O'MAHONEY's request for information.

1. In reference to your memorandum of September 11, 1951, the following is submitted:

2. It will be impossible for the Navy to agree to cancel pending orders to veteran volunteer reservists involuntarily recalled. It is hoped that after January 1, 1952, it will not be necessary to call any more enlisted personnel in this category.

3. The situation in regard to officers is such that the Navy cannot cancel pending orders to veteran volunteer reservists who

are being called involuntarily. Neither can the Navy agree not to call any more such officers. The total officer strength of the Regular Navy is 42,334. To officer the Naval Establishment as recommended by the JCS and approved by the Secretary of Defense and the President will require 80,500 officers on July 1, 1952. The Navy is commissioning about 9,000 officers a year. Under present facilities and funds this cannot be greatly accelerated, nor can these young men immediately take the place of experienced veterans.

4. To agree to either points I or II would result in a progressive degeneration of the war readiness of naval operating forces through lack of sufficient numbers of adequately trained personnel.

L. T. DUBOSE.

MEMORANDUM FOR THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
Washington, September 11, 1951.

In reply to your request for an Air Force position on the query of Senator O'MAHONEY, the following is submitted:

(a) It is assumed that the query has reference to unpaid reserve categories.

1. The Air Force is not ordering enlisted personnel in this category to active duty. Those who desire release will be separated as soon as possible but in no case later than 12 months from the date they reported to duty.

2. The Air Force is reducing the calls to active duty of Reserve officers in this category to the minimum consistent with urgent requirements in critical skill areas that can be met from no other source. There are very few outstanding orders and personnel involved have in every case been given an opportunity to request delay or release before appropriate delay and appeal boards.

3. Revocation of orders is not considered appropriate. Where hardship becomes apparent in individual cases, revocation is the normal policy.

(b) Concerning future policy, it is the intent of the Air Force to eliminate ordering to duty of unpaid Reserves with the exception of the following:

1. Reservists who desire active duty and for whom a requirement exists.

2. Limited critical skill reservists who are absolutely essential to the fulfillment of urgent operational commitments of the Air Force.

The Air Force does plan to order into active duty small numbers of paid Reserve forces personnel as may be necessary in meeting approved force objectives.

JAMES P. GOODE,

Deputy for Personnel Management

(For and in the absence of Eugene M. Zuckert, Assistant Secretary of the Air Force).

MEMORANDUM FOR ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE (MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL)

PROCUREMENT BRANCH,
September 11, 1951.

Subject: Ordering reservists into the active military service.

1. Reference is made to your memorandum, dated September 11, 1951, requesting certain information for Senator O'MAHONEY.

2. With the present program of releases, plus the need for additional officers as a result of the change of structure in the Army, the Army has a considerable requirement for additional officers, and cannot at this time commit itself to using only those officers who have had less than 12 months' service in World War II.

3. The Army does not favor ordering officers of the Inactive Reserve into the active military service against their will and will make every effort to avoid such action.

4. It will probably be necessary to order into the active military service officers of

the Volunteer Reserve who have had 12 months' service in World War II.

5. It will undoubtedly be necessary to order into the active service a number of Organized Reserve units whose personnel may have had 12 months' service in World War II.

6. Therefore, the Army cannot commit itself to using only those reservists who have had less than 12 months' service in World War II. The most recent program for involuntary ordering reservists into the active military service was limited to the Volunteer Reserve. This program, with its liberal exemptions for hardship cases and occupational specialties, failed to produce sufficient combat arms company-grade officers in the company grades. At present the only source of combat arms company-grade officers is the Organized Reserve units and the Inactive Reserve.

7. In view of the comments above, it is obviously impracticable to cancel pending orders to volunteer officer reservists now in a delay status who have had 12 months' service in World War II. Enlisted reservists in a delay status were canceled.

EARL B. JOHNSON,
Assistant Secretary of the Army.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Washington takes it for granted that the Senator from Wyoming and he are in agreement that what the Senator from Wyoming has just offered to the Senate as having come from the Defense Establishment bears almost no similarity to the reference to this question made in the committee report on page 7, where the committee in good faith says:

Short of all-out global war the committee does not expect any branch of the armed services to call any more men involuntarily into service who have had 12 months' service during World War II.

My own understanding of what the Senator from Wyoming has just offered is that it is not only likely, but it is almost a certainty, that every one of the three branches of the service does intend, for one reason or another, to continue to call into active service some of the voluntary and inactive reservists who previously have had 12 or more months of service in World War II.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me say to the Senator from Washington that I think his statement is not strictly accurate, because it is explicitly set forth in the memorandum with respect to enlistment in this category that the Army is making no calls on these men; the Air Force is making no calls on these men; the Navy expects to stop calling such men by January 1, 1952; and the Marine Corps has virtually exhausted such men.

That is the situation with respect to enlisted men. With respect to officers, the situation is as follows:

The Army is not now issuing active-duty orders to men in this category, but may have to do so in the future.

(c) Mrs. Rosenberg is developing a coordinated program to screen any future plans for recalls from the viewpoint of need, utilization, and alternate sources.

(d) Training programs for replacement personnel have been accelerated to the maximum but the flow does not yet meet urgent, immediate requirements.

I believe that this memorandum indicates the clear intention on the part of the Department of Defense to cooperate

in this matter and stop the calling of men in this category, save only that they do not want to upset the rotation program and do not want to jeopardize the national security.

Mr. CAIN. My only purpose in asking the questions yesterday and today is to make as certain as we can that the most accurate information is available, in order that Senators and Members of the House may intelligently and accurately respond to their mail. Should the Senator from Wyoming so permit, I should like to give him my own reaction to the memorandum he has just read from the Defense Establishment.

The memorandum which Secretary Rosenberg has submitted to the Senator from Wyoming in answer to the questions raised in our discussion of yesterday appears to state only in general terms what the services are now doing with respect to the recall of inactive or volunteer reserves. If I am correctly informed, the Army ceased a few months ago the calling of enlisted personnel of the inactive reserve who served during World War II. The Marine Corps has already called to active duty almost all, if not all, of its inactive reservists, so that the problem so far as the Marine Corps is concerned is to get these men released as early as practicable. The Navy is still calling—so I am informed—and plans to continue to call, both officers and noncommissioned officers of the inactive reserve. The Air Force, in order to meet the 95-wing program, will be short of pilots and navigators, and to meet these requirements anticipates calling members of the inactive reserve.

I am unable to reconcile the anticipated plans with the sentence which I have read from page 7 of the committee report.

Mr. President, I think this question ought to be resolved, and that the Congress ought not to say one thing in an official report, while the Department of Defense issues recall orders in direct contradiction to what the committee, in the best of good faith, has offered to the Senate. Members of the reserve, whether they are now on duty, now under orders, or now still at home, have an overriding interest in the answer to the questions which several of us raised yesterday and are raising now.

The Korean War started more than 14 months ago, and more than 8 months ago the President determined that we required a military force of three and one-half million men. It would seem to me that during all this time the Department of Defense could have figured out its manpower requirements in sufficient detail so as to be able to tell us now exactly, and not in general terms, how these requirements are to be met. But the Congress continues to receive information only in broad and vague terms. I believe that as Members of the Congress we are entitled to this information in order that we may be honest and forthright in replying to the thousands of letters which we are receiving weekly from reservists throughout the country.

I know that in the days immediately ahead thousands of young Americans

are going to clip the Senate committee report information out of the newspapers and send it to us with the request that we promptly see to it that they are not called to the Federal active service, out of the inactive and volunteer reserve.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. Certainly.

Mr. CARLSON. I appreciate the statement of the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and the statement of the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] on the problem which we discussed rather generally yesterday.

I am pleased to note that the Army is making every effort to live up to its program of releasing the enlisted reservists, 5 percent in July, 10 percent in August, 20 percent in September, 25 percent in October, 25 percent in November, and the balance in December. That information comes to me from the hearings. Of course, we are pleased to note that their schedule is up to date.

Yesterday it was stated on the floor of the Senate that no man who served in Korea in the last winter campaign would be called to serve another tour of duty, for which we are all grateful.

However, I think there is another problem which has not been solved, and that is with respect to the inactive reservists and the enlisted reservists, although the enlisted reservists are taken care of, according to the schedule. I refer particularly to the second lieutenants, the first lieutenants, and the captains. It seems to me that they have nothing to look forward to but to full 17 months of service. There is only one answer to the problem, and I should like to address myself to it for a moment. It is the expansion of the officer-candidate schools.

During World War II we had officer-candidate schools which graduated officers at the rate of 200 or more a day. I note from the hearings that at the beginning of the war in Korea we had a capacity of 400 officer candidates in the officer-candidate school, which is located at Fort Riley, Kans. In February of this year we had increased the capacity to train officer candidates to 4,000. Now I am advised that as of this date we can train 8,000 officers.

The question naturally arises as to why the officer-candidate schools are not filled. If my information is correct, it is impossible to turn out 2,500 officers from a school which has a capacity of 8,000. It seems to me that the military authorities have fallen down in the situation.

Mr. CAIN. I share in general the views which have just been expressed by the distinguished Senator from Kansas. I believe it would be relatively simple for the Defense Establishment to tell us what kind of effort they are making to prepare and train young officers out of the Korean War generation, in order that we may not have to call up Inactive Reserve officers and enlisted personnel to serve in the Korean War, and that we may more rapidly release from active duty in Korea such officers and enlisted

personnel as are presently serving. Does the Senator from Kansas have any additional information on the status of the officer-candidate schools and on the programs and policies relating to them?

Mr. CARLSON. My information is based on the hearings and discussions with individuals who are familiar with the situation as to officer candidate schools. Of course, we are training some splendid officers at West Point. We are training some very good officers in ROTC units. However, in the present situation we are using officers who were in the Inactive Reserve. When they entered that status, they felt that they would not be called into service unless an actual war was declared. I believe they are entitled to some consideration.

I wish to say to the Senator from Washington that I had fully intended to reoffer the amendment which was stricken by the committee. However, in view of the statements of the chairman of the subcommittee and contacts with the Defense Department, I am convinced that they are doing the best they can. I sincerely hope that they will continue to try to improve a situation which I think is unjustified and unwarranted in view of the length of time they have had with the program.

Mr. CAIN. I thank the Senator. In view of the fact that the Defense Establishment is going to reexplore the whole question of the proper utilization of the Inactive or Volunteer Reserves, and how to avoid calling them to active duty, I should like to read at least a portion of two letters recently received, one by myself and one by a colleague, dealing with this question. One of these letters is dated September 6, and comes from a city in Massachusetts. The writer of the letter, who is a major in the Inactive Reserves, writes as follows:

I would like to mention the following points which are most unfair in the program of recalling members of the Reserve components:

1. No real recognition is given to length of service during World War II. I served from April 1, 1941, to February 28, 1946 (59 months) which is much longer than the average length of service. As a first lieutenant, Army, Infantry, I am presently under orders to report for active duty on October 16 for a period of 24 months.

2. Very few Reserve units are being called to duty. Why can't Active Reserve officers and enlisted men be called in as individuals to replace those of the Inactive Reserve? The Active Reserve has indicated interest in serving by their willingness to attend drills, meetings, and summer camps for which they are paid.

3. I signed up for the Reserve Corps for a 5-year period with no intention on my part to extend it. The time has expired, yet I am compelled to serve since the time limit was extended indefinitely and the choice of resigning withdrawn. This strikes me as a violation of a contractual agreement I entered into with the Army.

4. What has the Army planned, or accomplished, in the direction of creating a new and young supply of officers? Are they active in promoting the use of ROTC? Are they operating officer-training schools, such as Fort Benning, to their fullest capacity? Fifteen months after I was drafted as a private in April 1941 I was commissioned as an officer from Fort Benning. Almost the same length of time has passed since the start of

the Korean War. If the Army is doing what they should be doing a new supply of officers should be graduating steadily and these should be used to immediately replace the inactive reserve officers.

5. Officers who are overage-in-grade for the combat arms should be immediately released from duty or from orders if they haven't already reported.

It strikes me that the Defense Department and the Army is following a blind and unrealistic policy. By continuing this policy they will wreck the whole future structure of the Reserve Corps, for nobody in their right mind would again consider signing up for the Reserves after the example of shabby treatment they have been receiving since last summer. Do they expect the morale of men like me to be high? I do not feel the least bit cooperative and I'm sure this will reflect in the performance of my duties if I am compelled to serve against my will under the conditions which exist today. I know I do not speak for myself alone. I know this feeling is universal among the Reserves, especially the Inactive Reserves who were called involuntarily, and it most definitely will affect the quality of the Army.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CAIN. Most certainly.

Mr. GILLETTE. Does not the Senator from Washington fully agree with the writer of that letter when he asks the question as to whether there was a clear violation of an implied contract, if not an express contract, in holding him beyond his period of time?

Mr. CAIN. I could not agree more fully. I believe it is a very legitimate question to ask. It is a question which ought to be studied thoughtfully and sincerely by both the Defense Establishment and Congress.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. CAIN. I shall be pleased to do so.

Mr. GILLETTE. Does the Senator from Washington agree that the memorandum presented by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], intending to be reassuring, lacks completely any assurance as to the policy in the future?

Mr. CAIN. It is my own view that the Senate committee was totally misinformed. I believe the Senate committee acted in good faith yesterday when the distinguished Senator from Wyoming said he thought and had reason to believe that none of the services had any further intention of calling voluntary and inactive reservists to active duty. The memorandum from the Assistant Secretary's Office says, in effect: "In those cases where we are not presently calling such inactive reservists and volunteers to active duty, we are most likely to be confronted with a need to do so at some time in the future."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Will the Senator permit me to interrupt?

Mr. CAIN. Certainly.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me say that I endeavored yesterday to make it quite clear that I was not giving a hard and fast assurance, and it was because of that fact that I sought to get the additional information, in cooperation with the Senator from Washington. However, I did point out that the three services are uniting in their program of rotation, and that the only thing in the

world that restrains them from giving an absolutely conclusive agreement is that they know that to do so would seriously impair the military efficiency of many of the units.

I have before me the testimony which was presented in the committee. The Army's presentation made it clear that the proposed 12-month provision would in all likelihood necessitate the recall of additional National Guard and Reserve divisions and small units for the sole purpose of using individual members to fill levies to meet overseas requirements.

For the Navy, the statement was made that the ships of the Navy would require trained replacements for thousands of petty officers whose loss during the first half of the fiscal year 1952 had not been contemplated; and later the witnesses said that the Reserve replacements had been exhausted and that replacements could be obtained only by new procurements and training.

It is obvious that if by law we require the discharge of certain individuals in certain categories, and if thereafter it is impossible to obtain replacements except by drawing upon untrained persons, the situation is one of the most extreme difficulty.

I feel that the memorandum I read, after exhibiting it to the Senator from Washington, shows a clear intent on the part of the three services to comply. However, let us not overlook the seriousness of maintaining the efficient military strength of the armed services.

I have before me carefully prepared statements which were issued in behalf of each of the services. The first of these is by Gen. J. Lawton Collins and Earl D. Johnson, Assistant Secretary of the Army.

The second is a statement which was made by the late Admiral Forrest Sherman, on behalf of the Navy.

The third is a statement by Gen. Hoyt S. Vandenberg, on behalf of the Air Force.

Finally, there is a statement by General Cates, on behalf of the Marine Corps.

I shall not undertake to read these statements at this time, but I now ask unanimous consent to have them printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT CONCERNING EFFECT ON THE ARMY OF THE RELEASE OF VOLUNTEER RESERVISTS UPON THE COMPLETION OF 12 MONTHS' ACTIVE DUTY

The 12-month plan, although outwardly commensurate with Army capabilities for releasing enlisted personnel, materially differs as to timing and flexibility of release. The Army capability would enable specialists to be retained until they can be replaced and would enable local commanders to stagger the releases to maintain the efficiency of their units. For example, a Signal battalion with 100 key specialists who came into the Army in the same month would be rendered ineffective under the 12-month plan. Insofar as officer personnel is concerned, the 12-month plan would have a grave effect on the Army. There are now in the Army 46,500 Reserve officers who were called to active duty as individuals. If the 12-month plan were put into effect during the next year, it

would be necessary to order into active military service at least 38,550 officers to replace the officers discharged. This does not allow for continuity or overlap necessary to maintain combat effectiveness, estimated to require an additional 6,000 to 7,000 officers. Replacement officers must be procured well in advance of departure dates of outgoing officers. It is emphasized that a 12-month period of service will produce an effective tour of duty of about 10 to 11 months.

To accomplish its mission, the Army must maintain its forces in the United States and overseas at maximum strength. Consequently, before large numbers of officers can be discharged, trained replacements must be available. At the present time there are only three sources of trained-officer replacements available:

(a) From the organized units of the Reserve Corps.

(b) From the Inactive Reserve.

(c) Individual volunteers.

The Army position has been that no individuals should be involuntarily recalled to duty if they are members of organized troop-basis units. This concept is based on our over-all mobilization plan which places great emphasis on the future availability of complete units in the Organized Reserve. If we strip these units of their officer strength, our mobilization plan is seriously affected. A considerable number of officers have already volunteered, and it is questionable whether large numbers could be obtained from this source. In view of these facts, it would appear that the great bulk of replacements would, of necessity, come from the Inactive Reserve.

J. LAWTON COLLINS,
EARL D. JOHNSON,
Assistant Secretary of Army.

STATEMENT CONCERNING EFFECT ON THE NAVY OF RELEASE OF VOLUNTEER RESERVISTS UPON THE COMPLETION OF 12 MONTHS' ACTIVE DUTY

If legislation is enacted requiring the Navy to release veteran volunteer reservists after a maximum of 12 months' active duty, its implementation by the Navy will immobilize for varying periods of time many of the ships and units which have been reactivated within the past year and will create seriously adverse conditions in remaining fleet units, including those in Korean waters.

The ships and units reactivated during the past year have been approximately 75 percent manned by naval reservists and their crews are still predominantly Reserve. If faced with this legislation, and in order to remain mobile, these ships and units will require trained replacements in such categories as gunners' mates, boilermen, quartermasters, sonar-men, machinists' mates, radiomen, pharmacists' mates, radar-men, etc., for the Naval Reserve petty officers released by this requirement. Such replacements are not currently available in such numbers as will be required in some critical ratings, either in the active Navy or in the Naval Reserve still on inactive duty.

Insofar as commissioned officers are concerned, such a release program will require the ordering to active duty of additional thousands of veteran Volunteer reservists as replacements for those whose release would be accelerated.

Aside from the loss of efficiency within individual units caused by this heavy turn-over, and the additional expense to the Government of calling large numbers of personnel to active duty for only 12 months' active service, it will entail the ordering of thousands of Volunteer reservists to active service with little or no advance warning. The net result insofar as the Navy is concerned of any mandatory release program for veterans after 12 months' active service will be con-

fusion comparable to that experienced in 1946 in the face of a world situation infinitely more serious in its possible effect to this country.

FORREST SHERMAN.

STATEMENT CONCERNING EFFECT ON THE AIR FORCE OF THE RELEASE OF VOLUNTEER RESERVISTS UPON THE COMPLETION OF 12 MONTHS' ACTIVE DUTY

Legislation requiring the release of the Volunteer Air Reserve airmen at the end of 12 months would have no effect upon the Air Force inasmuch as our recently announced plan provides for release of these airmen at 12 months, if they so desire. The officer situation is entirely different, however. Release of the Volunteer Air Reserve officers at the end of 12 months, which is 9 months earlier than now planned, has an unacceptable impact on maintenance of a combat effective force. This has been repeatedly emphasized in previous presentations to congressional committees. Volunteer Air Reserve officers ordered into active military service represent primarily critical skills that will be needed for the maximum allowable time as now prescribed by law. In this connection, the release plan of the Air Force should not be interpreted as entirely inflexible. Consistent with the intent of any of the proposed release plans, the Air Force has no intention of holding these Volunteer Air Reserve officers any longer than absolutely necessary. Accordingly, to the maximum extent that trained volunteer replacements can be made available, these reservists will be released short of 21 months.

A second consideration that should not be overlooked concerns the additional recalls from the Volunteer Air Reserve made mandatory by such a plan. As you know, Organized Air Reserve resources have been virtually depleted; therefore, the Volunteer Air Reserve constitutes the only remaining resource the Air Force can draw upon to augment normal officer procurement from ROTC, OCS, etc. Under a 12-month release plan, approximately 17,300 officers would have to be ordered into service from the Volunteer Air Reserve during fiscal year 1952 in addition to the already planned recall of 14,250 under a 21-month release program.

For the above reasons, the Air Force opposes the proposed provision of law requiring release of Volunteer Air reservists at the end of 12 months' service.

HOYT S. VANDENBERG.

STATEMENT CONCERNING EFFECT ON THE MARINE CORPS OF THE RELEASE OF VOLUNTEER RESERVISTS UPON THE COMPLETION OF 12 MONTHS' ACTIVE DUTY

Under a program of mandatory release upon completion of only 12 months' active service, large numbers of veteran Volunteer Reservists must be released considerably before the time currently planned. The Marine Corps has on active duty essentially all of its reservists who are usable under conditions such as the present. Unlike the larger services, additional reservists cannot be ordered in to replace those released. The early procurement of additional recruits and new second lieutenants as replacements would require an increase in both the ceiling and average strengths (with a resultant increase in total cost). At this very late date it would be physically impossible to procure and train these replacements (even if the authority and money were available) before the trained reservists would have to be released. This could have but one result—the serious lowering of the combat efficiency of major Marine Corps units, not only in the United States but also those in action in Korea. The Commandant feels obligated to make this point clear so that the Congress will

understand the effect which would be precipitated by their action in releasing these Volunteer Reserve veterans after only 12 months' active duty.

C. B. CATES.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am quite confident that if the Members of the Senate were to read the statements and if they had listened to the testimony, as the committee did, they would come to absolutely the same conclusions.

We sincerely regret the difficulty; but it must be remembered that these men are scattered through the three services, and some of them are concentrated in companies or battalions or regiments or on naval vessels, and to take all of them from one unit would deprive some companies or battalions or regiments or naval vessels of their essential, key personnel. Of course the committee did not wish to do that.

So I trust that the amendment will be agreed to. I assure the Members of the Senate that when the bill goes to conference, because those who will serve as Senate conferees feel exactly as do the Senators who have spoken, we shall give this matter additional consideration and shall discuss fully with the conferees on the part of the House the entire situation, in the hope of improving it.

I feel that the record is replete with testimony, from the top-flight commanders on down, including the Secretary of Defense and the Assistant Secretaries of Defense, that the purpose is to remedy this situation.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the atmosphere in which this question has been discussed has been most friendly, and certainly I am grateful for that.

I have neither a desire nor an intention to overlook any of the realities of the day in which we live. However, I, like many of the other Members of this body and many of the members of the Reserves, both the active and the inactive ones, wish only to know what the facts are, so that we may be guided accordingly.

Mr. President, to repeat by way of emphasis, but with no desire to be disrespectful to anyone, let me say that on yesterday we observed that in its report the committee has said:

Short of all-out global war, the committee does not expect any branch of the armed services to call any more men involuntarily into service who have had 12 months' service during World War II.

In that sentence the committee has said that on the basis of the advice which has come to it, it is convinced that no more Inactive and Volunteer Reserves will be called into the Federal service if the men have served for as long as 12 months in World War II.

During our colloquy on yesterday, I asked the Senator from Wyoming what he meant by the use of the word "men" in that sentence. Quite frankly and fully he said that it covered both enlisted personnel and officers.

All I have endeavored to establish in our minds is that whatever may be the reasons for it, the armed services believe they are confronted with a situa-

tion which will demand that they continue to call inactive and volunteer reservists into active service, and we must take this opportunity to advise the Nation what the situation appears to be.

Mr. President, I do not know how many inactive and volunteer reservists are going to be called into the active service; but I hold in my hand a recent issue—that for August 31, 1951—of the United States News and World Report, and on page 40 that issue carries an interesting article which all of us should read. The article bears the title "Why Reserve Calls Go On." I now shall ask unanimous consent to have this brief but illuminating article printed in its entirety in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From United States News and World Report for August 31, 1951]

WHY RESERVE CALLS GO ON

WHY ARE RESERVISTS STILL BEING RECALLED?

Basically, it is because the Armed Forces are still expanding. Manpower strength is going up at least 250,000 men this year. Also, the need remains critical for really skilled and experienced leaders and specialists.

JUST WHO IS BEING RECALLED NOW?

The Air Force is calling in about 21,000 Reserve officers from its Voluntary Reserve during the year to end June 30, 1952. The Navy is ordering up about 3,000 officers from its Organized Reserve and 1,000 to 2,000—including some chaplains—from its Volunteer Reserve. The Army is going to recall at least 5,000 officers in the volunteer category, and it may need another 10,000 or more before the year is up.

Some of those needed will volunteer. But many will have to be recalled involuntarily. There's no guaranty against recall for a Reserve officer, so far.

YET A NEW WHOLESALE RECALL OF OFFICERS IS NOT LOOMING?

No; the Armed Forces are just going ahead with the limited program adopted last spring. It won't approach the call-up of last winter. Some changes are in the wind, however, that could make a much larger call for reservists necessary.

WHAT MIGHT CAUSE RECALLS TO EXPAND?

Two possible developments. One is final approval by Congress of a new plan to require discharge after 12 months of active duty for veteran Reserve officers and enlisted men who were not in drill-pay status when they were recalled last winter. This plan was approved by the House in the form of an amendment to the Defense Department appropriation bill. The amendment was written by Representative JAMES E. VAN ZANDT. The Senate may knock out the Van Zandt rider, as the Defense Department hopes. But, if adopted, this plan will boost demand for trained replacements—who can only be found among Reserves.

The other possibility is additional expansion in the Armed Forces. Both the Army and Air Force are asking for more men. If their requests are approved, they will need more Reserve officers than they now plan to get.

EXACTLY WHAT FACES AN AIR FORCE OFFICER?

He is one of approximately 200,000 individuals left in the pool of World War II AF Reserve officers. In months ahead he is likely to get a set of orders to report to a nearby air base for 4 days of physical exam and interview. If he's a pilot, navigator, bombardier or flight engineer, in good

health, with fairly recent flying practice, he almost certainly will be urged to volunteer. If he refuses, he may be drafted sooner or later, though the Air Force says its official policy is to avoid using any flight personnel psychologically motivated against flying. Electronics experts and men versed in administration and supply are in demand too. Many will be recalled, voluntarily or otherwise.

At this time, not more than 14 percent of the physically fit Air Reserve officers face recall. But, with any expansion, the numbers will go up. If Air Force goes from 95 groups up to 125, for example, 75 percent of qualified officers in the pool may be required.

WHAT ARE CHANCES FOR A NAVY OFFICER?

The Organized Reserve group numbered 15,000 a year ago. About 9,000 have been recalled, leaving 6,000 at home. About 3,000 of those—1 out of 2—will be recalled by next July. The remaining 3,000 will go out to duty in the following year. In the Volunteer Reserve group, the Navy has about 235,000 World War II officers. It plans to call very few of these—no more than 1,000 or so. Volunteers will fill the bill in most cases. But, when volunteers are lacking, some specialists will be drafted. Last example of that is the involuntary recall of chaplains, just announced.

HOW ABOUT AN ARMY OFFICER?

The Army hopes to draw not more than 5,000 World War II veterans from its pool of Reserve officers. They will come from the Active Reserve. Officers in the Inactive Reserve will not be recalled, as a rule. Here again, however, specialists can and will be drafted as required. Most Army officers who are over-age-in-grade and who have not been training in some fashion are not to be recalled.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, at this time I shall refer to only one portion of the article, as follows:

JUST WHO IS BEING RECALLED NOW?

The Air Force is calling in about 21,000 Reserve officers from its Volunteer Reserve during the year to end June 30, 1952.

I do not know that to be a fact; but if it is in part a fact, it is a complete contradiction of the information provided to the Appropriations Committee, which entitled that committee to say to us in all sincerity that it believes that no further calls of Volunteer and Inactive Reserves will be made by any of the armed services.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. Certainly, sir.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In the interest of strict accuracy, let me say that what the committee said was an expression of its own feeling. The statement was that—

The committee strongly feels that the plans of the armed services should be coordinated—

And so forth. The next sentence reads as follows:

Short of all-out global war the committee does not expect any branch of the armed services to call any more men involuntarily into service who have had 12 months' service during World War II.

That was an expression of belief and hope to the armed services, and was not a statement interpreting the testimony which was given, for my explanation of the testimony throughout was that be-

cause of the nature of the military situation in Korea, it would be impossible now, in the opinion of the military, to follow the inflexible directive of the Van Zandt amendment.

Mr. CAIN. And, yet, I think it perfectly fair to say that the average American citizen, particularly the Inactive and Volunteer Reserve, would wish to be guided literally by a sentence appearing in the report of the Senate committee, which, in effect says, "We, a committee, after carefully studying this situation, are convinced that the armed services have no further intention of calling up these Inactive Reserves." What the Senator from Wyoming has said, and said very pleasantly, is that the committee simply got the idea from some source that there would be no future calling up, but from a source which appears to be almost in direct contradiction to the information provided to the Senator from Wyoming by the Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, if the Senator will now permit me—

Mr. CAIN. I gladly yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think that is not the correct interpretation of what has been said or of what the situation is. The Senator from Washington has been an effective and an intelligent Member of this body for some years, and he knows perfectly well that there is a great difference between language in a bill and language in a report. When the House committee speaks, it speaks for the House committee; and when the Senate committee speaks, it speaks for the Senate committee. We are now in this parliamentary status: A provision written into the House bill has been deleted in the Senate committee bill, and until we have a conference and the conferees meet and agree, then we do not have the final word of the Congress. The Senator from Washington knows that to be so.

Mr. CAIN. I would say to my friend from Wyoming that the Senator from Washington has no desire to labor this point much further. I have, however, several additional comments to offer. One of them is that what the Senator from Wyoming has just said gives me great distress. He has pointed out that the Senator from Washington knows that there is a great and vast difference between the language used in the bill and the language used in the committee report. Unfortunately, that is too often true. But one fact is undeniable, that average American citizens, who are the ones whose rights we seek to protect, receive any words coming from the Senate of the United States or from the House of Representatives as being factual, objective, accurate, and true. I said yesterday, and I repeat it, that I merely thought the Senator from Wyoming and his associates had been misinformed. I at no time suggested that the committee sought to misinform the Senate, because the Senator from Wyoming went out of his way overnight to provide the Senate with additional information.

Mr. President, I shall and will soon conclude but wish first to offer for the RECORD—and I presume I had better read

it—a letter from a combat major engineer now in Korea, which reflects on the question we are discussing, and I should appreciate it if the Defense Department would give consideration to his views. He merely writes to say:

AUGUST 30, 1951.

Senator HARRY P. CAIN,
Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAIN: I wish to thank you for your prompt reply and for furnishing me with a copy of Public Law 51. Having a copy of the bill has enabled me to answer many questions for men in the unit and has cleared up many erroneous opinions to the satisfaction of all concerned.

We who were active members of the battalion prior to its being called to duty have a feeling that we are being discriminated against in that shortly after we were called there was a sudden cessation in the calling of reservists either active or inactive. Consequently we feel that we are classed as those that got caught.

I am wondering what action is being taken to release from the service the active reservists? We feel that we have done our share in that we have sacrificed homes, families, and jobs for over a year by being back on active duty, 7 months of which has been in Korea. This on top of from 3 to 5 years service in World War II tends to discourage the incentive in an individual especially when there is apparently no relief in sight for the few who were chosen.

As I previously mentioned we have been in Korea for 7 months. Now we are informed that local regulations place us in competition with members of the Regular Army for rotation to the States. It is little wonder that a feeling of discrimination prevails. Were the Army our chosen career there would be no grounds for such feeling but most of us desire to carry on with our civilian life and as time progresses this is becoming increasingly more difficult.

Any information that you can furnish me on the status of the active reservist with particular emphasis on his release from the service will be appreciated.

My only necessary or required response to the major is to send him the remarks which appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday and today.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Oregon raised many of these questions in the general Appropriations Committee session, on the mark-up, and reserved his right of final decision on the over-all question until the bill reached the floor. The Senator from Oregon is not yet prepared to say what his ultimate judgment on this question will be.

One question on which it may be that the Senator from Washington has an opinion—or, if he has not, on which perhaps the chairman of the subcommittee in charge of the bill may be able to help us—is this: Is there in effect at the present time in the Defense Establishment a priority in rotation? May I have the attention of the Senator from Wyoming to the question, please? It may be helpful in getting an answer. I think this particular question was not raised during our consideration of the bill. We were rushed at the time, and as a result, we did not get all the information which I should have liked to have. The question I am asking at this time is this: Is there

any system of rotation in effect which gives priority in rotation to those veterans of World War II who had at least 12 months of service in World War II, over those who have come into the service and are now in Korea, but who did not have such original service in World War II?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is my understanding, I should say to the Senator, that such priority is not given, for the reason that in the system of rotation it has been desired to release soldiers who served through the winter in Korea, or who have served for a period of 3 or 4 years without having had actual service in World War II. I find this statement with respect to the Army:

A major effect of the 12-month provision with respect to both officer and enlisted personnel would be the necessity for suspension of overseas rotation planned to commence September 5, 1951, when many individuals will complete 4 years' continuous service overseas in December, and the 12-month provision would necessitate further extension of their overseas tour.

General McFayden, of the Army, when testifying before the committee, described the system, with a chart to illustrate his testimony. I read from his statement:

General MCFAYDEN. I will take time to show you the complete personnel picture of the Army for the remainder of this year and next year, and I think it is of fundamental importance in understanding the magnitude of this particular amendment. The Army at the present time is accomplishing two things which are somewhat unparalleled in modern times. One is the rotation of an entire field army, actively committed against an enemy; rotation by individuals and not by sending a certain number of people who replace a certain number of people, but within that sending the radar operator to replace the radar operator, and the gunner to replace the gunner, and so forth.

At the same time, the Army is in a state of partial mobilization, call it what we will, but we are in a state of partial mobilization, conducting an active operation, and at the same time we are functioning under personnel limitations, as to lengths of service, something that was never encountered in World War I, and never encountered in World War II.

There is other testimony to the same effect. The release procedure was described by General McFadden in the following words:

Now, we plan to stagger out in the 60-day period ahead of the 17 months, these officers. Not all will go in 60 days, but some will begin. Local commanders will decide which officer will leave early and which officer will leave late, depending upon their particular need, with, of course, preference to the veterans of long service overseas in World War II as opposed to the individual with small or no service overseas.

There is a preference to a degree when such preference can be exercised, but not an over-all preference.

Mr. CAIN. I may say to the Senator from Oregon that my understanding is that no officer or enlisted man is given preference with reference to rotation in Korea because of any prior service in World War II. My information, though I may be incorrect, is that the system of priorities for rotation in Korea is determined by the length of time a service-

man, officer, or enlisted man has served in Korea.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. Certainly.

Mr. CORDON. The statement just read by the Senator from Wyoming would indicate that there is a preference given to those who served in World War II, and that such preference, by degree, at least, favored those who had served the longest period in World War II. That preference certainly is what should be given, and I am interested in whether, as a matter of fact, it is given.

Mr. CAIN. That I do not know to be a fact.

Mr. CORDON. I think we must have in mind that we are dealing with human beings, that we are dealing with families, that we are dealing with a very considerable segment of our citizenry, and that those who served in World War II had their service over 5 years ago. They are now 5 years older. They have been assimilated into the life of the country. They have taken over the obligations of citizenship. They have wives and children, and they are in an altogether different position in this matter from that of a young man who has not yet become identified with respect to family, the obligations to support a family, to support himself, and to take his position in the civilian aspects of the country. Unless something is done to set aside sharply the preference so as to permit those who because of age alone would not be taken today if it were purely a question of draft, but who are taken solely because they have a Reserve status—unless something is done for a more definite rotation—I would strongly support the rotation which is provided for in the bill; and I do not want to do that.

I realize that we are facing a condition and not a theory. I realize that the situation is not the ideal. I realize that it has been bungled, and I realize that what we were led to believe was a striking force that could strike at "4 o'clock in the morning" was nothing of the kind, and that we have put back into uniform many men who never should have been called. Someone has bungled and whoever it is, there is a responsibility which he must take. But the fact still remains that we face a condition. I should hesitate to go along with the provision that was inserted in the House, solely because, as a practical proposition, it might militate against the maintenance of the cohesive force which is necessary, but I want to do anything and everything I can to impress upon the military authorities the necessity of the earliest possible rotation of the men of older age who have already been in World War II and who were released from that war and have been taken back into the service, not because of an all-out emergency or an all-out mobilization, but solely because it was more convenient to take them.

Mr. CAIN. It seems very plain that the Senator from Oregon, the Senator from Wyoming, the Senator from Washington, and all other Senators are joined in one common effort. We seek to have

such a Military Establishment that those inactive and voluntary reservists now serving in a second war in Korea can be released and the sooner the better, and that in the future it will be completely unnecessary to call to the colors those splendid men who made a contribution in World War II.

All that I have attempted to do, with the very willing cooperation of the chairman of the subcommittee, has been to emphasize the question, to bring it again to the attention of the Military Establishment in the hope that no single effort will be overlooked to provide a result which will give us manpower out of this generation to fight the Korean War. Those fine young men who fought in World War II held the fort, plugged the dike, so to speak, in Korea, beginning 14 months ago, when we did not have the Military Establishment which many of us thought was prepared for such an emergency.

I shall lend every effort I can with any Senator on either side of the aisle so to speed up our processes that we may return to private life those contributors to freedom and victory in World War II. Their example ought to be followed by those who were too young or not required to fight in World War II. Any war is a rotten, miserable business, but every generation ought to be required, as most of them are willing, to assume the responsibilities and burdens of their generation.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. Certainly.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would most respectfully say to the Senator that I think the discussion he has brought forth has been extremely helpful. The Senator knows that I have in Massachusetts an extreme case, because I showed the Senator a letter—

Mr. CAIN. And I was so bold as to use that letter without mentioning the author of it, or the fact that it had come from my friend from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am glad the Senator did so. My position in the committee in connection with striking out this amendment was purely to make it possible for us to work out the best possible language in conference, because I felt and knew that the language as it was written, while it was an effort to accomplish the objective, would cause more harm and more unfairness than it would do good. I think we should work out an amendment, if it is necessary to do so, and are convinced that the military need one.

Mr. CAIN. I personally share the opinion just expressed by the Senator. We must have sympathy for these men, unless we are absolutely convinced that the Defense Establishment itself is going to make such an amendment unnecessary.

Mr. FERGUSON and Mr. CASE rose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] has the floor. Does he yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, for the reason, sir, that I have an associate who is

leaving the city, and I must leave the floor, I want to pay my personal respects to the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], who has a very difficult job to perform. I think he has been extraordinarily helpful and sympathetic to the emphasis some of us have placed on the pending question.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the Senator from Washington for the kind words he has just uttered. I want to say that I think he has performed a distinct service in the questions he addressed to me yesterday and again today. I feel his discussion has served to clarify the situation. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] has spoken the mind, I think, of the committee, and I feel that a great deal has been gained by what has been said. I thank the Senator from Washington.

Mr. CAIN. We want, sir, to take the Senator's good hopes in the committee report and breathe some real life in them, and I think we will do it before the contest is over.

REPLY BY ROBERT McCORMICK TO SENATOR MORSE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall take only 2 or 3 minutes. Earlier this afternoon I paid my disrespects to an editorial which appeared this morning in the Washington Times-Herald and Sunday morning in the Chicago Tribune. Those two yellow newspapers are published by Robert McCormick, of Chicago.

Following my comments in the RECORD, I noticed on the ticker this afternoon, and was very much amused by it, the reply of Robert McCormick, the publisher of the Chicago Tribune and the Washington Times-Herald. His reply was that MORSE is a New Deal liar. Of course, it only goes to show, Mr. President, what happens to that kind of a man when journalistic senility overtakes him, as is the case with Mr. McCormick. It shows what journalistic hardening of the arteries does to a newspaperman, Mr. President.

I am convinced it has reached such an advanced stage with McCormick that if a liberal thought could ever get through his cortex, a thought that placed the interest of the American people above the reactionary forces he serves, he would die of a brain hemorrhage.

I dismiss him, Mr. President, by refreshing the memory of the American people of the fact that he is the publisher of a newspaper which, following the Battle of Midway, published a Navy dispatch which it had obtained surreptitiously, and which disclosed that we had broken the Japanese code. For my money, when the Chicago Tribune published that message, Mr. President, which any self-respecting newspaper with any patriotic impulses would never have published, it came so close to committing an act of treason and jeopardizing the lives of thousands of American boys, that I repeat what I said earlier this afternoon, that whenever the Chicago Tribune or the Washington Times-Herald insults the junior Senator from Oregon with any of their smear tactics, I consider it a great compliment. I

would consider myself disgraced if I ever found Robert McCormick supporting me politically.

PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S ADDRESS AT THE DEDICATION OF THE GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, earlier today the President of the United States, in an address to the people of the Nation on the occasion of the dedication of the General Accounting Office, made certain comments on the present fiscal condition of the United States and the prospects of our fiscal condition in the future. I am afraid the President was not conscious of the effect of his statement upon inflation when he related some of the facts which he used in his address. It appeared that he had no fear of the pressure that the expenditures being asked for would have upon inflation in the United States.

It should also be observed that the President's comment on the functions of the General Accounting Office appear to be erroneous. He seems to think that the General Accounting Office, while being under Congress, had the function of determining whether or not there was efficiency or waste in Government. Mr. President, that is not the function of the General Accounting Office. The function of the General Accounting Office is to make post audits. It only goes into the question of the legality of expenditures; not whether there is waste in the expenditures. It simply considers the question: Has the expenditure been authorized? It does not determine whether the expenditure has been efficient or wasteful or whether there has been destruction of property or waste in the use of property.

As to whether there is waste in Government, I think the President probably knows the facts as well or better than most people in the United States, because he served as chairman of the Senate's War Investigating Committee, and it was then his function to go into details respecting expenditures of Government. I know that the reports put out by his committee time after time showed that there was inefficiency, that there was wastefulness in Government. While the reports of his committee were most beneficial and did result in great savings in the prosecution of World War II, I have no reason to suppose that conditions of waste and inefficiency to which he then directed his attention are not being duplicated today.

All we have to do is to ask any veteran of our armed services about that subject. I doubt if there is a single one who would not recall at least one instance, and even more, when he witnessed the deliberate discarding or destruction of articles or commodities that were useful and had a value.

The President, among other things, referred today to expenditures of Government as they relate to prosperity, income, and profits and the like. He referred to them even after paying taxes. I think he should know full well that we have not yet seen any more than a glimpse of what we are going to see in the way of Federal expenditures in the future.

For example, let us consider the defense appropriation bill now under consideration. The bill we are now debating calls for the appropriation of \$61,000,000,000. But we find that actually only \$39,000,000,000 will be spent in 1952. That leaves a net amount of \$22,000,000,000 for future expenditure. We are also informed that the Department of Defense has \$44,000,000,000 of appropriated but unexpended funds from past years. In sum, Mr. President, we see a picture of \$66,000,000,000 in outstanding commitments to be spent in future years, beyond what we may further appropriate in the future. It is the inflationary impact of that kind of pent up spending authority which we have not yet seen, and have yet to feel.

Now, when it comes to the actual spending of those sums we will have to find revenue to cover the spending. It is then, Mr. President, that we shall see what is left after taxes. Then we shall see what the increases are in the cost of food, in the cost of clothing, and of other necessities of life. As I have said, that sum on the books is spending authority and is to be spent in addition to the sum which will be appropriated for current expenditure in future years.

Mr. President, after this military appropriation bill came over from the House the Senate committee added a certain amount. I wonder how many have noted the coincidence that the appropriation amount added was approximately equal to the figure which appears in the pending tax bill. So the increase in this bill alone would eat up the total amount of the tax increase, which was designed to cover the deficit predicted when the 1952 budget was initially submitted. Yet we are talking about a pay-as-you-go basis. The President again stated in his address today that he expects the people to pay as they go.

I realize that the President, when he compiled the budget and submitted it to the people, did so with a claim that not one cent could be taken from it without dire harm to the United States. As one of the advocates of economy and efficiency in government, and the elimination of waste, I am compelled to make reply to that contention and to his address today.

The President made the further statement that in the past 5 years we have been operating on the basis of a surplus of nearly \$8,000,000,000. Let us find out how the President arrived at the figure of \$8,000,000,000 surplus.

In 1951—last year, so far as the finances of the Government are concerned—he had estimated a deficit of \$2,700,000,000. In anticipation, taxes were raised, but the Government could not spend as fast as was anticipated. There is a limit on what can be actually expended. So we ended with a surplus of \$3,500,000,000, not because the administration did not want to use the money, but because it was physically impossible to spend it.

In 1950 we had a deficit of \$3,100,000,000. Taking those 2 years, the net surplus is reduced to \$400,000,000. In 1949 we had a deficit of \$1,800,000,000. So if we take the 3 years, we have a net deficit of \$1,400,000,000.

But the President did not want to take just 3 years. He wanted to take 5 years, so he also took 1948 and 1947. Those happen to be the years when we had the Eightieth Congress, which the President defined as the worst Congress in the history of the United States. The reason he called it the worst Congress is that it was a Republican Congress. But it was a Congress which cut expenses. As a result of cutting expenses there was a surplus during that Republican Congress. It is now convenient for him to draw upon the results of that Congress to show a 5-year record of surplus. That is the only reason why he included the fiscal record of the Republican Eightieth Congress in his tabulation today.

In 1948, during the second session of the Republican Eightieth Congress, we had a surplus of \$8,400,000,000. Taking the last 4 years and balancing out the net deficit of the subsequent 3 years, we have a surplus of \$7,000,000,000. But the President wants also to use the first session of the Eightieth Republican Congress, in 1947; we then had a surplus of three-quarters of a billion dollars. Thus over a 5-year term it can be shown that we have had a surplus of \$7,800,000,000. That is the figure which the President used before the public today, telling them that in the past 5 years Congress has not had a deficit, but has been operating upon the basis of a surplus of nearly \$8,000,000,000.

That is one way of looking at it, and I appreciate the implied tribute he makes to the Eightieth Congress, since its surpluses of more than \$9,000,000,000 were more than sufficient to offset the net deficits of the succeeding years.

But that is another way to look at it, and I submit it is more realistic, because it deals with more current fiscal problems. In the past 3 years the balance would have been a \$1,400,000,000 deficit. It is only when we add the \$9,100,000,000 surpluses of the two sessions of the Republican Eightieth Congress that we find an over-all surplus for the term of 5 years the President chose to employ.

I hope that the Senate appreciates the real pressures which are being caused by these enormous appropriations. As I stated yesterday on the floor of the Senate, it is not always a question of what is actually spent within the current fiscal year. As I have noted, the bill before us represents anticipated actual expenditures in this fiscal year of only \$39,000,000,000. That is all the military could spend because of the situation with respect to tools, facilities, raw materials, and so forth. The effect of that kind of spending is sufficiently alarming, but the inflationary pressure upon the economy is even greater than the effect of actual expenditures by virtue of the expenditures which we authorize. That is true because of the fact that when we authorize expenditures, contractors who are asked to bid, go out over the country and try to find raw materials and facilities with which to fulfill those forthcoming orders. That causes an ever-widening pressure upon the economy of the United States.

Mr. President, the time has come to recognize that there is waste and inefficiency in government. All branches of

the Government must see to it that we recognize that there is waste. Every branch of Government, every Member of Congress, and every individual citizen must see to it that all should put their shoulders to the wheel.

Let us remember that the Government has no independent resources or any source of revenue except the productive capacity of the American people and the taxes they pay. If anything will ever result in bringing a socialistic government to the United States, it will be the influence of increased taxes and Government expense. When we take from the American people in the form of taxes, the capacity to make and lay aside a surplus, there will be only one place where money can be obtained for the further development of our resources or even the maintenance of our productive capacity, and that will be the Federal Government. When that day comes, the day of socialism will have arrived, because the essence of socialism is control and operation of a nation's resources and production vested in the state.

We have alarming indications of that kind of situation today. When the RFC came before the Appropriations Committee, its representatives stated that there were more applications for assistance than there ever were previously because that is the only agency which can furnish the money for expanding production. The banks and other financial institutions are unable to do so because the Federal Government is taking so much of their capital and the capital in which they deal through taxes. All we have to do is to read the history of the British Empire in the past decade to see that the thing which put the British into socialism was high taxes and inefficiency in government. They took from their people money which should have gone to the people for their own investment. So I hope the President will see what these enormous expenditures have done in the way of producing inflationary pressures upon our economy, and may yet do to our entire system. I hope that there will be a reversal in the position of the Executive, and that he will co-operate with Congress to the end that we may reduce the costs and expenditures of Government. It is idle otherwise to talk about any pay-as-you-go plan, and the alternatives to such a plan, as we all know, contain the seeds of destruction.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5054) making appropriations for the National Security Council, the National Security Resources Board, and for military functions administered by the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, before the minority leader [Mr. WHERRY] left earlier in the afternoon because of his indisposition, I had an understanding with him. I agreed with the Senator from Nebraska that I would not ask for a vote this evening upon any amendment. I have consulted with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and the majority leader [Mr. MCFARLAND],

Inasmuch as we had been discussing the amendment with respect to reservists, and apparently had come to an understanding among those of us who participated in the discussion, including the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] who raised the question, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and myself, it is my thought that if we may now adopt the amendment the Senator from Wyoming will then ask that the Senate take a recess until noon tomorrow.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I assume that the chairman of the subcommittee still has in mind that when this matter reaches the conference the question of the reservists will be gone into thoroughly.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Completely.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Wyoming and the Senator from Michigan had a colloquy yesterday on the floor of the Senate in relation to that question. I think the situation has been somewhat changed by reason of a report from the Defense Department.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. We all share the same opinion, and it is the desire of everyone on the committee with whom I have consulted, and I believe of everyone on the floor, that it shall be made perfectly clear in the final action of the two Houses on the bill.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, it would be impossible for me, by silence, to join in the statement of the Senator from Wyoming that this subject is thoroughly understood. During the debate two or three points were discussed between the Senator from Washington and myself, and he suggested, when he had to leave the floor, that I should carry on. I deferred to several other Senators who wanted to speak on the subject. I do not want to reopen the whole discussion now, but the opinion of the Senator from Washington, as he expressed it to me when he went out of the Chamber, was that the matter was not settled, and that the fat was in the fire, so to speak. He felt that some agreement should be reached—which had not been reached—as to what the situation is. Normally a committee report would be regarded as advisory upon the Department of Defense. The committee stated very strongly that the plan should be coordinated, and so forth. The committee stated further that it did not expect the armed services to call any more reservists involuntarily.

The statement read by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] indicates that it is hopeless to expect the Defense Department to regard the committee's statement as an admonition.

Of course, everyone knows that the Constitution provides that Congress shall make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces. Yet here we have a situation where a committee of the Senate has expressed itself. Such an expression normally would be advisory, if not in the form of an admonition. Nevertheless we have a letter from the Defense Department

which entirely disputes the position taken by a committee of the Senate.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE. Yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I believe the understanding which was reached with the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], and all other Senators who have heretofore participated in the debate, is that it is a matter which is to be worked out in conference. With that I completely agree. From my conference with the Senator from Washington I understood, that it was his understanding too. I just now expressed it again to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], who is a member of the subcommittee, and who will be a member of the conference.

So I can assure the Senator from South Dakota and all other Senators that the elimination of the provision which was contained in the House bill does not mean that the Senate is closing the door. It only means that we shall reopen the issue in conference and come to a clear and definite understanding on the part of both Houses of Congress. Of course the action of the conference will be reviewable in both Houses.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Such understanding would be binding on the military forces, of course.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Unquestionably.

Mr. CASE. The statement of the Senator from Wyoming is what the Senate wanted to have, I believe. Without that kind of statement, it would appear that the language in the committee report had been washed out, that the subject had been left in a sort of nebulous condition, and that we would be left with the various statements that had been made on the subject.

I agree with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] that the matter should be explored by the conference, and that the conference should come forth with a clear-cut statement so that the reservists, the Defense Department, and Congress will know exactly where they stand. We have these conflicting statements before us now. We should have one clear-cut statement as a result of the conference action.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is the understanding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 55, line 17.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, there has been considerable discussion with respect to the use of military personnel and reservists. In connection with the discussion I should like to invite attention to the use of the National Guard for replacements in Korea. Recently I registered a protest with the Department of the Army because of a proposal to disintegrate the National Guard units, instead of assigning them intact to combat service.

General Collins has sent me a four-page letter, explaining in detail the policies of the Department of the Army with regard to the use of military personnel.

I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed in the body of the RECORD, at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES ARMY,
THE CHIEF OF STAFF,
September 7, 1951.

HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK,

United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR DWORSHAK: Thank you very much for your recent letter in behalf of many constituents who have communicated with you concerning the withdrawal of officers and enlisted men from the One Hundred and Forty-eighth Field Artillery Battalion, Camp Carson, Colo. I have had the Army General Staff look very thoroughly into this important problem of levies on National Guard units as a whole and on the One Hundred and Forty-eighth Field Artillery Battalion in particular, and I am grateful for this opportunity to write to you personally about it. Accordingly, I am furnishing you a detailed report on the careful consideration which the Department has given this matter and on the critical factors which leave no alternative but to withdraw some personnel from the One Hundred and Forty-eighth Field Artillery Battalion, as well as from other National Guard units, at this time.

The overriding need which creates this problem is the requirement for rotation of individuals in our overseas theaters, including rotation before this coming winter of all personnel who endured the bitter combat conditions in Korea last winter. This situation alone is currently requiring the replacement of some 30,000 men and officers each month. I do not think anyone will dispute the urgency of this need, but some have questioned the method proposed by the Army to meet it.

The majority of personnel needed to replace Korean veterans are men from the combat arms. They include officers and many specialists, such as light weapons infantry leaders and field artillery section chiefs. These officers and specialists naturally require much more training than the basic instruction being given inductees. At present the Army can look only to the following sources for such personnel: operating units of the United States, training units, service schools, general Reserve units—which includes the One Hundred and Forty-eighth Field Artillery Battalion—the Western Hemisphere Reserve, and units alerted for overseas shipment. There are no other sources from which we may get the highly trained type of personnel we so urgently need.

The Army must keep the units in each of these six categories at sufficient strength so that they can perform their assigned missions. For example, it would be obviously unwise if, in order to avoid any levies on National Guard units, the Army reduced instructor personnel in training divisions and service schools below the strength needed to train new inductees adequately. Therefore, the commanders of our six continental armies have been instructed to secure the personnel needed to meet our requirements in the Far East from the available sources in the order in which they are listed above.

Now the first three of these sources—operating units, training divisions, and service schools—have already been drawn upon to the maximum practicable extent, but have not been able to provide sufficient personnel with the critical military occupational specialties. Since the men who have just completed basic training in training divisions are not, in most instances, trained in the more advanced specialties required by the Far East Command, and since most of the personnel who are so trained are in combat-type units, such as infantry, artil-

lery, and armored units, an important part of the burden imposed by the requirements of the Far East Command necessarily falls on the fourth source—general reserve units.

The units in the fifth source—our Western Hemisphere Reserve—are highly specialized emergency units which must be maintained at full strength, if they are to be available to fight anywhere they are needed, should an unforeseen emergency arise. Consequently, they should not be drawn upon except to a very limited extent and then only as a last resort. To satisfy rotation requirements by taking men from the last source—those divisions or other units which have been alerted for overseas shipment—offers no solution, since the gaps left by such withdrawals would have to be filled immediately by drawing from other sources.

Three other possibilities exist for decreasing levies on National Guard units, but none of them is feasible. The first, replacement or rotation on the basis of units rather than individuals, is precluded at the present time by the controlling factors of manpower, equipment, and training time. Currently, the majority of our units are now in overseas theaters, and since the number of units there and the number in the United States qualified and available for assignment overseas are not balanced, rotation by unit is clearly not feasible.

The second possibility would be to call into active Federal service more National Guard or Reserve units so that the impact of levies on the units now in service would be reduced. This would be a most uneconomical procedure since it would entail calling up complete units to obtain certain individuals with specific military occupational specialties. Moreover, this method would not meet immediate Army needs because a considerable period of time is required to place a unit in an active status and to train its officers and enlisted men to the point where they can perform efficiently in combat.

The third possibility would be to recall additional individuals, many involuntarily, to active duty from the inactive or volunteer reserve. Here again, however, time does not permit the required notice to such individuals plus the training necessary to equip them for combat.

Thus it is necessary for the Army to continue to levy upon National Guard units and Regular Army units in the United States, in order to carry out a reasonable program for the rotation of those men who have fought through last winter's campaign. Since the units in Korea have maintained their effectiveness under combat conditions while releasing men for rotation, I do not think the current personnel changes will impair the effectiveness of the units being levied upon. One obvious advantage will be the influx into such units of returned Korean veterans, which will increase the combat effectiveness, not only of the National Guard units, but also of the rest of the Army in this country.

It is the definite policy of the Department of the Army, in accordance with section III of the National Defense Act, to maintain, insofar as practicable, the integrity of National Guard units ordered into the active Federal service. For the reasons set forth above it is no longer practicable to keep, without limitation or qualification of any kind, all original personnel in these units. However, the National Guard units are required to furnish individual replacements only after they have been in the active Federal service long enough to become well established in Army procedures and training. This period is presently set at 4 months. Moreover, personnel levies on National Guard units for individual replacements are concentrated on their inductees whenever possible. I can assure you the Department fully recognizes the advantages

of unit integrity, such as you point out, and it was only with great reluctance that the practice of withdrawing individuals from National Guard units was adopted for the reasons outlined herein.

It should be noted that the One Hundred and Forty-eighth Field Artillery Battalion has received a great many fillers from non-National Guard sources since coming on duty May 1 of this year, and recently reached an authorized strength nearly three times its original strength of National Guardsmen. In connection with the above-mentioned levies the Army's inquiry concerning the situation at Camp Carson, Colo., does not indicate that the One Hundred and Forty-eighth Field Artillery Battalion has been discriminated against in favor of other units at that post. In fact, the enlisted levy for September for the One Hundred and Forty-eighth is less than for any of the several other field-artillery battalions there, and includes mostly inductees and Regular Army enlistees, and only a very few of the original National Guardsmen who came on duty with the unit. Some of the other battalions will furnish twice as many enlisted men as the One Hundred and Forty-eighth. The first officer levy for the One Hundred and Forty-eighth is scheduled for November and December, with some officers attending courses at schools in the meantime. While the officer levy may seem comparatively high, this is due to the fact that the One Hundred and Forty-eighth was exempt from the large Army-wide officer levy for the August to October period, during which several other field-artillery units at Camp Carson were levied upon quite heavily with the exception of the one-pack artillery unit there. It is anticipated that this specialized unit will also be levied on to meet November and December overseas requirements.

In connection with your specific request that careful consideration be given to the possibility of maintaining the One Hundred and Forty-eighth Field Artillery Battalion intact for further training and future assignment as a unit, I should like to point out that under present circumstances this organization will require several months of further training before it reaches a state of readiness where it can be assigned a unit mission. As I have already indicated, the pressing manpower problem before the Army is the great need for trained individual replacements. The general reserve units, which include many National Guard organizations of a size comparable to that of the One Hundred and Forty-eighth Field Artillery Battalion, are one of our few sources for such replacements. To exempt any one of these units at this time from levies would certainly not be fair to all of the others, especially when that one will not be ready for an assignment as a unit for an appreciable length of time. We certainly cannot exempt all of them. To do so would mean a drastic slow-down in rotation from Korea.

I trust that the foregoing will fully explain the reasons why the Army is compelled to withdraw individuals from the One Hundred and Forty-eighth Field Artillery Battalion and other similar units at this time, and will also clear up any misunderstanding concerning the Army's action in this matter. I can assure you that the very natural desires of the people of Idaho to keep intact the One Hundred and Forty-eighth Field Artillery have been fully understood by the Army, and every effort has been made to solve our critical personnel problems without resort to levies on such a unit. As the result of our thorough study of the situation, however, I am convinced that there is no satisfactory alternative if we are to meet our pressing manpower requirements successfully.

With kindest regards,

Sincerely yours,

J. LAWTON COLLINS.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, yesterday an agreement was reached with respect to the amendments which had been passed over. The agreement was that they might be reopened at this session of the Senate. Today, because much of the time of the Senate was occupied by a discussion of matters other than the appropriation bill, we have passed on only two of the amendments which had been passed over yesterday.

Therefore I ask unanimous consent, if it is necessary to do so, or make a statement of our understanding, that all of the amendments which have been passed over, and which were to have been reopened today, may be in the same status tomorrow.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. After a talk I had with the Parliamentarian yesterday, I hope the Chair will put the request in the form of a unanimous-consent agreement, instead of leaving it as an informal understanding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the agreement made yesterday by unanimous consent covered all amendments, those which were held in abeyance and those which had been tentatively approved. Is that the unanimous consent request of the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That was not my understanding. If that was the agreement reached yesterday, it ought to apply tomorrow as well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Parliamentarian advises the Chair that that was part of the agreement entered into yesterday.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I ask unanimous consent to that effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

RECESS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 27 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, September 12, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate September 11 (legislative day of September 4), 1951:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Charles F. Baldwin, of Maryland, now a Foreign Service officer of class 1 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

The following-named persons, now Foreign Service officers of class 2 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls general of the United States of America:

Max Waldo Bishop, of Iowa.

Gerald A. Mokma, of Iowa.

Marselis C. Parsons, Jr., of New York.

Elmer E. Yelton, of Virginia, now a Foreign Service officer of class 5 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

the possibility of partisanship entering into the further consideration of the Japanese situation and the far-eastern situation generally, in connection with the treaties which will presently be before the Senate for ratification. But, Mr. President, I feel that bipartisanship is a two-way street. I regret exceedingly that the President of the United States, in referring to the accomplishment in San Francisco, failed to give to Mr. Dulles the credit to which I think he is entitled for his wonderful generalship of the treaty negotiations over a period of 12 months. Mr. Arthur Krock has called attention to this omission in an article entitled "Before the Gavel There Was the Spade," published in yesterday's New York Times, in which he points out that "had it not been for the spade of John Foster Dulles the gavel of Mr. Acheson could not have been wielded as it was at San Francisco."

In making these remarks, I am in no way reflecting on Mr. Acheson, who handled that proceeding in such a masterly way. I paid tribute to him yesterday. But we simply have to have an atmosphere of bipartisanship in dealing with this matter, and it was a great shock to the Republicans who attended the conference in San Francisco when, on the very day on which we were planning to open the conference, the President of the United States appeared in San Francisco at a public gathering which was entirely Democratic, and to which none of the Republicans had been invited. It was a wonderful opportunity to have brought together the delegates to the conference and to have them all sitting together, with the President of the United States addressing us in an informal way before the convention opened. But, unfortunately as it seemed to me, the President took the occasion as he said himself, to be a Democrat, during the luncheon and until 2 o'clock in the afternoon, and he then became an American in the evening, for the opening of the conference.

I mention that because I am one of those who favor doing all we can to keep partisanship out of the far-eastern situation. I urgently request that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle join us in this endeavor, and urge the President to deal with this matter in the bipartisan way in which those of us who were delegates, both Republicans and Democrats, tried to deal with it in San Francisco.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I am sure the Senator from New Jersey realizes, does he not, that there are many of us on this side of the aisle who feel exactly as he feels, in wanting to keep politics completely out of our foreign policy, and, even though there may be some misunderstandings occasionally, there are many of us who expect to work with him in arriving at a bipartisan foreign policy on which we can all stand and upon which we can all agree.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the Senator from Louisiana. In committees on which I have served with him, notably during the joint hearings of the Armed Services Committee and the Foreign Relations Committee, I have felt that he has always expressed that point of view, and he has been a champion of the right approach to bipartisanship in these critical times.

Mr. LONG. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Before the Gavel There Was the Spade," by Mr. Arthur Krock, to which I have referred, and which appeared in the New York Times of September 11, 1951, be inserted in the body of the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN THE NATION—BEFORE THE GAVEL THERE WAS THE SPADE

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, September 10.—The President's praise of the steersmanship of the Japanese peace treaty conference at San Francisco by his Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson, reflects a general opinion here which is shared by many Republican critics of our foreign policy, as Senator KNOWLAND revealed in the Senate today. Mr. Acheson's firmness and skill in dealing with Mr. Gromyko's effort to frighten the non-Communist world from going through with its program was a vital factor in assuring that the conference would proceed according to schedule, and, in view of the more extreme Republican attacks on the Secretary of State, Mr. Truman's comment was natural.

THE REPUBLICAN CONTRIBUTION

But if the President permits or encourages the impression that he thinks Mr. Acheson's contribution played the principal part in saving the conference from "ruin," or if administration Democrats make claims to this degree, the path of the Japanese peace treaty toward ratification may become obstructed by partisan politics and an unfortunate dispute over credits may soil the campaign of 1952. That is because, for the first time in a major foreign policy enterprise by Mr. Truman and Mr. Acheson, the foundation of success was laid by a Republican. Had it not been for the spade of John Foster Dulles the gavel of Mr. Acheson could not have been wielded as it was at San Francisco.

From the moment the seed of the treaty was given for nurture to Mr. Dulles until he put the firm fruit into the hands of the Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles maintained close consultation with leaders of his own party in Congress and outside it. Also, as he publicly testified, had not General MacArthur prepared the soil the seed would not have sprouted. Moreover, there are two Republican signatures to the treaty—those of Mr. Dulles and Senator WILEY; Senator BRIDGES signed the bilateral security pact with Japan; and Senators SMITH and HICKENLOOPER were official participants in the proceedings at San Francisco.

TIME FOR TROUBLE

The excellent purpose of this was to restore to foreign policy that actual bipartisanship which in this administration has been largely a matter of words. Paraphrasing Harold E. Stassen, this was a rare instance in which the Republicans were brought in at the take-off instead of being besought for aid only after the crash landing. If an effort is now made to put the Japanese

peace treaty and the successful conference in the category of exclusive achievements by the administration, partisanship at the expense of the pact will be forced into its consideration by the Senate.

Though the majority leader, Mr. McFARLAND, promised to try to have the treaty approved by the Senate at this session, that plan has been virtually abandoned for several reasons. One is the crowd of legislative priorities in a Congress which is set on adjourning early in October. Another stems from the problem of shifting over in Japan from the status of occupation to the joint security arrangement, a problem complicated by the war in Korea. This has evoked a feeling at the Pentagon that 2 or 3 months, at least, should elapse before the fundamental change in Japan's international situation is established by law. This means Senate action will not come until next session.

WAITING WITH MONKEY WRENCHES

In the meantime, if the treaty gets into partisan American politics that will be the atmosphere in which it will be debated by the Senate. Many who have worked hard for the accomplishment it represents greatly fear the consequences this would entail not only on the text of the fact itself but on Governments which associated themselves with the United States at San Francisco despite many misgivings. In Asia particularly, these consequences could be disastrous.

Though the Republicans mentioned above were parties to the evolution of the treaty, and Mr. Dulles did exactly 100 percent of the groundwork which culminated in the division of 49 nations to 3 at San Francisco, there is a Republican group which only awaits an opportunity to assail some of the terms. As always, too, when Moscow is on one side and the free world on the other, Communists and their sympathizers in the United States will follow any destructive leads which may be offered. Nothing would better suit critics and enemies of the treaty than to see the Democrats and the Republicans embroiled over an issue of political credit and the treaty itself projected into the partisanship of the 1952 campaign.

TIME WILL TELL

For all these reasons the issue should be avoided by friends of the treaty, by friends of Mr. Dulles and the Republicans who aided him, by friends of General MacArthur, who gave the treaty his broad approval, and by supporters of the Administration and Secretary Acheson. The responsible persons among them are the only ones who can project it, chief among them Mr. Truman. The issue cannot be importantly posed by the minor professionals in the "Get-Acheson" movement, in the Republican party or in the ranks known to be sympathetic to communism.

The next few weeks will disclose whether this great bipartisan attainment in American foreign policy is to be treated as such, and thus safeguarded from dangers which could come from partisan expansions of the President's comment.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4914) to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations, and for other purposes; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing vote of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. VINSON, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. KILDAY, Mr. DURHAM, Mr. SHORT, Mr. ARENDT, and Mr. COLE of New York were appointed

managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 15. An act to amend section 215 of title 18 of the United States Code;

H. R. 319. An act to amend title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, by providing for treble damage actions;

H. R. 581. An act for the relief of Isabel Tabit;

H. R. 627. An act for the relief of Mrs. Tjitske Bandstra Van Der Velde;

H. R. 644. An act for the relief of Mrs. Shizuko Yamane;

H. R. 970. An act for the relief of Antonios Charalambou;

H. R. 982. An act for the relief of Willem Smits;

H. R. 1454. An act for the relief of George Crisan;

H. R. 1920. An act for the relief of Hoshi Kazuo;

H. R. 2158. An act for the relief of Sister M. Crocefissa and Sister M. Reginalda;

H. R. 2160. An act for the relief of Sister M. Leonida;

H. R. 2179. An act for the relief of Ilona Agoston;

H. R. 2292. An act for the relief of Jai Young Lee;

H. R. 2514. An act for the relief of Maria Theresa Stancola;

H. R. 2787. An act for the relief of Thomas Alva Raphael (Richards);

H. R. 3176. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the life and perpetuate the ideals and teachings of Booker T. Washington," approved August 7, 1946;

H. R. 3214. An act for the relief of Irene Senutovich;

H. R. 3463. An act to authorize the transfer of certain naval vessels;

H. R. 3819. An act for the relief of Ann Elisabeth (Diana Elizabeth) Reingruber;

H. R. 3823. An act for the relief of Shozo Ichikawa;

H. R. 3957. An act to provide that certain functions of the Comptroller of the Currency which relate to building associations organized in, or doing business in, the District of Columbia, shall hereafter be performed by the Home Loan Bank Board, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4024. An act to authorize certain easements, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4038. An act for the relief of Dr. George Alexandros Chronakis;

H. R. 4113. An act to amend section 125 of the National Defense Act to provide that distinctive mark or insignia shall not be required in the uniforms worn by members of the National Guard of the United States, both Army and Air;

H. R. 4260. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to transfer to the Department of the Interior the Quartermaster Experimental Fuel Station, Pike County, Mo.;

H. R. 4443. An act to prevent the entry of certain mollusks into the United States; and

H. R. 4674. An act authorizing the Secretary of State to continue Hervé J. L'Heureux to serve as Chief of the Visa Division for an additional year commencing September 1, 1951.

CONSTRUCTION AT CERTAIN MILITARY AND NAVAL INSTALLATIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the

bill (H. R. 4914) to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. RUSSELL. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. BYRD, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. SALTONSTALL conferees on the part of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, September 12, 1951, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 15) to amend section 215 of title 18 of the United States Code.

INCREASE IN BASIC RATES OF COMPENSATION OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENTAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I take this occasion to say that the junior Senator from Nevada approves the report of the committee on Calendar 531, Senate bill 622, a bill to increase the basic rates of compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes. The committee, in its report, states that, having considered the bill, it reports favorably thereon, with amendments, and recommends that the bill, as amended, do pass.

Mr. President, this slight raise in pay, in the opinion of the junior Senator from Nevada, is long overdue. However, in the opinion of the junior Senator, even with this raise, the compensation does not quite overtake the current inflation. I simply want to go on record at this time as favoring the increase.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5054) making appropriations for the National Security Council, the National Security Resources Board, and for military functions administered by the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the next amendment passed over.

The next amendment passed over was, under the subhead "Incidental expenses of the Army," on page 18, line 22, after the word "sites", to strike out "\$187,914,000" and insert "\$194,514,000."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, before we proceed with the rather important bill, it seems to me we should have a quorum call. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator temporarily withhold the suggestion?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I withhold the suggestion temporarily.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the Senator from South Dakota wanted to in-

quire what amendment was pending. The Chair stated the amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It was the amendment on page 18, line 22, striking out the numerals "\$187,914,000" and inserting "\$194,514,000." If there is any objection to it, the Chair will rescind the announcement that the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CASE. There is objection. I should like to have an explanation of the amendment, but I would have no objection to having a quorum call before the explanation is made.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	Monroney
Bennett	Hendrickson	Moody
Benton	Hennings	Morse
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Bricker	Hill	Murray
Bridges	Hoey	Neely
Butler, Nebr.	Holland	Nixon
Byrd	Humphrey	O'Connor
Cain	Hunt	O'Mahoney
Capehart	Ives	Pastore
Carlson	Jenner	Robertson
Case	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Cordon	Kem	Smathers
Dirksen	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Duff	Knowland	Smith, N. C.
Dworshak	Langer	Stennis
Eastland	Lehman	Taft
Eaton	Long	Thye
Ellender	Malone	Underwood
Ferguson	Maybank	Watkins
Flanders	McCarthy	Welker
Frear	McClellan	Wherry
Fulbright	McFarland	Williams
George	McKellar	Young
Gillette	McMahon	
Green	Millikin	

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business in connection with their attendance at the conference for the signing of the Japanese Peace Treaty at San Francisco, Calif.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] is detained on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURRAY in the chair). A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 18, line 22, in reference to which the Senator

from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] has asked for an explanation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, in this amendment the Senate committee added \$6,600,000 to the amount appropriated by the House. The budget estimate was \$198,914,000. It was reduced by the House to \$187,914,000. The committee was impressed with the testimony offered on behalf of the Quartermaster Service that we should restore funds sufficient to provide for the employment of 1,592 employees out of a total reduction of 5,550 made by the House. In other words, we did not restore all the personnel cut requested in the budget and made by the House, so we recommended \$4,600,000 for the additional personnel. They will be used in quartermaster depots for procurement officers, in market centers, and in inspection service throughout the country, for quartermasters' supplies in Army areas, and in overseas commands.

The evidence presented to the committee indicated that during 1952 the Quartermaster General would have to handle approximately 4,123,000 tons of supplies as compared with 3,915,000 tons in 1951. There has been an effort to coordinate the storage and handling of various kinds of equipment and supplies. The Bureau of Ordnance, the Signal Corps, the medical staff, and the transportation sections, all have a part in some of these general depots, and because of the increased tonnage required to be handled, it would seem necessary to restore the portion of the personnel which had been reduced by the House.

In addition to that, \$2,000,000 of the sum which we restored for other than personal services is to be applied to the return to the United States of the remains of deceased military personnel from Korea.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Did the Senator state what the figure for this purpose was in fiscal 1951?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The appropriation for this purpose in 1951 was \$172,235,000 plus.

Mr. CASE. In other words, the figure of \$194,514,000 would represent an increase of about \$22,000,000 over last year?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It would be an increase from \$172,000,000 plus to \$194,000,000 plus; yes, about \$22,000,000 plus. But I should point out that there has been a 40-percent increase in the number of troops.

Mr. CASE. I am sure that no Member of the Senate would want in any way to limit the funds that would be necessary for the return of the remains of deceased soldiers from Korea. However, it is difficult for me to believe that the figure approved by the other body would have contemplated eliminating those funds. The \$187,914,000 suggested by the House would provide an increase of \$15,000,000 over the amount appropriated for the current year, and it would seem to me that that would be a very substantial increase.

Mr. President, I should like to have a vote on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment proposed by the committee, on page 18, line 22, to strike out "\$187,914,000," and insert in lieu thereof "\$194,514,000." [Putting the question.] The "ayes" seem to have it. The "ayes" have it, and the amendment is agreed to.

The next committee amendment passed over will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 18, in line 23, it is proposed to insert the following proviso: "Provided, That expenditures of appropriations contained in this act for public informational activities of the Department of Defense shall not exceed \$10,950,000 including pay and allowances of military personnel assigned to such activities."

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, on yesterday, in the course of his remarks, the Senator from Wyoming made the statement, which is printed on page 11364 of yesterday's RECORD, which reads as follows:

I know there are places in this bill where great cuts can be made.

At that time I asked the Senator from Wyoming to advise the Senate as to the places where great cuts could be made, and received the assurance that we would be told a little later in the discussion. I was unable to remain in the Chamber until the Senator from Wyoming finished, but in going over his remarks of yesterday I do not find where he pointed out any place where great cuts could be made in this appropriation bill. I am wondering if the Senator is prepared to tell us at this time just where cuts could be made. If he knows—and we have the word of the chairman of the subcommittee that great cuts could be made in the bill, and he has not pointed out where we could make them adequately—it seems to me we would be justified in supporting the motion of my colleague from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], that the bill be recommitted with instructions to make the cuts. But if it can be pointed out now where the cuts can be made, we may not have to do that.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, in response to the Senator from Vermont, let me say that in the first place I was under the impression that I had indicated precisely what I had meant. The Senator left the Chamber, and it is quite possible that the explanation was not quite as full as he might desire. I have a distinct recollection of saying that the naval program calls for the maintenance and supply of a fleet of 1,162 vessels, and I said, "I am not the person to say to what extent that should be reduced."

It is quite possible that it could be reduced. I went to the extent of going personally to the Pentagon Building, sitting down with the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff—all of this I detailed yesterday—and pointing out the query that was in my mind, and I thought would be in the minds of other Senators, as to whether or not so great a Navy would be actually needed. That is a place where a great cut can be made, if we should decide not to maintain 1,162

vessels. But I am now of the opinion that it would be a reckless thing for me to do to recommend that a cut in the Navy should be made while the tension on the world front is so great as it is.

Then I had in mind the appropriation for ordnance. The committee did make a cut of something like \$256,000,000 in tank construction because we felt with respect to this particular type of tank that it could be postponed until a future time.

Ordnance and repairs for naval vessels—

Mr. AIKEN. Were those cuts made after this bill was printed?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, no.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator's remarks referred to this bill as it is now before the Senate?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. A cut of \$256,000,000 in the item I mentioned is in this bill.

Mr. AIKEN. But the Senator said, "I know there are places in this bill where great cuts can be made."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am trying my best to tell the Senator of them. The statement was made against the background, I will say to the Senator from Vermont, that war is destruction; war is waste. But, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations having in charge the armed services bill and having listened to all the testimony, I am not willing to substitute my guess now that we could cut \$3,000,000,000 or \$4,000,000,000 or \$5,000,000,000 or \$6,000,000,000 here or there. I feel it simply cannot be done. That is all I had in mind when I was addressing the Senate yesterday.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I am quite disappointed that the Senator from Wyoming has no specific recommendations as to where cuts can be made.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If I had any specific recommendations beyond those which we have accomplished, they would certainly have been presented in the committee and would have been set forth in the committee's report.

Mr. AIKEN. Because the Senator certainly aroused my hopes when he said, and I quote him:

I know there are places in this bill where great cuts can be made.

I had hoped that he was going to point out some places where some substantial savings could be made. I am sorry that is not the fact, however.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. We could make cuts in the military strength, in the size of the Army. The Army has been held down. A few months ago Senators upon this floor and upon the radio and elsewhere were saying, "We ought to have a 12,000,000-man Army," or a 6,000,000-man Army. We have here a program for 3,500,000 soldiers. There has been much argument about the size of our Air Force. Personally I am convinced that air power must be expanded, not only in the United States Air Force, but in the Navy. Cuts could be made there, but I think they would be reckless cuts.

Mr. AIKEN. Inasmuch as the Senator from Wyoming has no specific

recommendations to make, I should like to pursue a little further the colloquy which I had with him a couple of days ago, with regard to what prompted the Army to sponsor a mystery serial radio program called *The Shadow*, a very intriguing program, in which the *Shadow*, by a flip of the wrist, becomes invisible. He hears all and sees all, and never exposes himself. He always rescues his girl friend from a horrible death at the last minute, and nabs the villain.

It seems to me that, rather than putting on such radio programs as that, if the armed services would employ the *Shadow* himself, we might dispense with a great many of the men we now have in the Armed Forces, and use the *Shadow* instead. But what justification is there for the armed services putting on such popular radio programs, which up to that time had been sponsored by private interests? The Senator said he would try to get some information on that subject. I wonder if he has any.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes. I pursued that inquiry, because I was quite surprised by the statement of the Senator from Vermont. It seemed to me to be of doubtful wisdom for the Army to sponsor such a program as that. I think I stated at the time that if it were done, I supposed that it had been done in the promotion of the directive which was given to the Army by the Congress in passing the renewal of the selective service bill, the manpower bill, a year ago, to make an extraordinary effort to bring about voluntary enlistments. I have a report from Mr. Clayton Fritchey, Director of the Office of Public Information in the Department of Defense. He says:

The *Shadow* was sponsored by the Army and Air Force for 13 weeks, January 7 through April 1951. It was a one-half show presented weekly over some 524 stations of the Mutual Broadcasting System.

Under the Army-Air Force recruiting program, financed by funds appropriated by the Congress, a contract was let by the Grant Advertising Co., Inc., 919 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill., which has the over-all Army and Air Force contract, for a sum of approximately \$150,000.

This program, at the time, was one of five radio and TV shows presented at various times and under different combinations of stations and networks, and aimed at varying types of listening audiences in order to make the widest possible appeal to young men and women to join the Army and Air Force.

The Grant agency has, in all such cases, made recommendations for various shows and was given Army and Air Force approval before award of any contract within its over-all and general contract.

Funds expended were from the fiscal 1951 budget for Army-Air Force recruiting and personnel procurement and were in no way connected with public information funds.

CLAYTON FRITCHEY, Director.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator from Wyoming for making that information available for the *Record*, because it does clear up the question as to whether or not the Army actually was sponsoring this program, *The Shadow*. It appears that it was sponsoring it, at a cost of \$150,000 for 13 weeks.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No. The cost of this program constituted only a part of the general over-all fund.

Mr. AIKEN. I understood, as the Senator read the memorandum, that it referred only to the program called *The Shadow*.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No. The statement is:

Under the Army-Air Force recruiting program, financed by funds appropriated by the Congress, a contract was let by the Grant Advertising Co., Inc., 919 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill., which has the over-all Army and Air Force contract for a sum of approximately \$150,000.

I interpreted that to mean that the \$150,000 was the over-all cost of all the Army and Navy programs.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not say that the Senator is not correct, but that was not my construction of the language.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Again, I say that it is of very doubtful wisdom to sponsor shows of that kind. But the thinking of the advertising agency apparently was that there were many people, like the Senator from Vermont, who listen to this program, and that perhaps they would be interested.

Mr. AIKEN. I listen to it. That is why I know about it. The question arises in my mind, however, as to the necessity of putting on elaborate radio and television programs to stimulate recruiting when the draft law is in effect. But I see that the Army puts the blame on Congress again, because it is said that this program was put on because Congress appropriated the money for it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, let us make the matter clear now, before the Senator goes further. He says that it seems rather useless that such a program should be carried out while the draft law is in effect. Let me read from the draft law. I read from section 20, under the heading "Effective date":

The Secretary of the Army for the Army and the Air Force, the Secretary of the Navy for the Navy and Marine Corps, and the Secretary of the Treasury for the Coast Guard, are hereby authorized and directed to initiate and carry forward an intensive voluntary enlistment campaign in an effort to obtain the required personnel strengths.

So the Congress of the United States instructed the Department of Defense to carry on such a campaign when that law was passed.

Mr. AIKEN. I did not hear the slightest reference to *The Shadow* or even to radio programs in the section of the law from which the Senator read.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The details of the program were not outlined. I call the attention of the Senator to the fact that by the rules of the Senate the Appropriations Committee is forbidden to write legislative riders into appropriation bills. If it is desired to curtail the expense of carrying on a voluntary-enlistment program so that fewer men will have to be drafted, the place to carry that story is before the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

The Army says, in effect, that if the Congress had not appropriated the money it would not have put this mys-

tery-serial program over the air on Sunday afternoons. It seems to me that the Army has given us a cue to the remedy.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield first to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, even though the distinguished Senator from Vermont enjoyed the program called *The Shadow*, does he think that the taxpayers of the United States should be expected to put up the funds so that *The Shadow* can be put on for the Senator's enjoyment?

Mr. AIKEN. The pleasure which the Senator from Vermont got from listening to *The Shadow* was considerably alloyed at the end when he found that he was helping to pay for it through taxation. I think there are probably private interests who would be willing to continue this program.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Along the line of the statement of the Senator from Wyoming, it is my understanding from the armed services and from the conferences on the unification bill and the Selective Service bill, that the best soldiers are volunteers. A volunteer who enters the service on his own volition contemplates a longer term of enlistment, with the hope that he may remain and make the Army or Navy a career. A drafted soldier is in for a shorter period of time, and it is reasonably clear that he will leave the service once his term is over.

Therefore, it is more efficient, more economical, and better judgment to secure the service of a man who joins the Armed Forces because he wants to do so, and will serve for a longer period of time.

With respect to the money which is spent for advertising, I have never listened to this particular program, and I very seldom listen to any such programs.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator should listen sometime. It is a very good mystery program.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I conclude by saying that over a long period of time any money which is spent for publicity for procurement of volunteers, if well spent by competent people, is of value to the taxpayers. I do not say that the program to which the Senator from Vermont has referred was that kind of program.

Mr. AIKEN. I believe that we should have as many volunteers as possible. However, there is not a college in this country where the boys do not know that they can volunteer for the Army if they want to do so. There are recruiting offices in every town of any size. It is absolutely unnecessary to put on multi-million-dollar programs—and that is what the total cost must amount to for all the armed services—in order to induce enlistments. I hope the programs are not put on for the purpose of keeping in right with the advertising medium they employ.

I am wondering about another factor. The contract for advertising was placed with an advertising concern in Chicago. There would be perhaps as much as \$22,500 which would go outright to one advertising concern as a fee. It seems to me that here is one place where we could save some money by stopping the elaborate multi-million-dollar advertising, publicity, and propaganda campaigns of our Government agencies.

I understand that the Department of the Treasury is sponsoring the Sammy Kaye orchestra. That must cost even more than The Shadow and other programs.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is the Senator from Vermont aware of the fact that the present budget contains an item of \$3,000,000 for advertising on the part of the Department of Defense?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes. I now yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Wyoming has stated that it would be beyond the power of the Committee on Appropriations to put a rider on the bill. That is correct. But certainly the Appropriations Committee is under no obligation to provide funds just because there is an authorization for a certain purpose. The Appropriations Committee repeatedly denies funds for projects for which authorizations have been made.

As an example of the way the so-called directive is being followed, I should like to read to the Senate a letter which was written by a sergeant of the recruiting service of the Army and Air Force on the 16th of July 1951. It is addressed to a young man who has received his preinduction notice. It should be borne in mind that this letter is from the recruiting service:

DEAR SIR: The Selective Service Board of—

The name of the town—

states that your preinduction draft notice will be in the mail within the next three (3) days.

Did you know that you can still volunteer—

That sentence, "Did you know that you can still volunteer," is capitalized and underscored—

for the Air Force or the Army before—

The word "before" is underscored—

you receive your preinduction notice? After receipt of your preinduction draft notice, you will be ineligible to volunteer for any branch of service.

Would it be possible for you to come into this office within a few hours after receiving this letter? We believe we have something that will be of vital interest to you.

Sincerely yours.

It is signed by the recruiting sergeant.

The point I wish to make is that we spend money to maintain the recruiting service and it is writing letters to boys after they get their preinduction notices, informing them that if they come to the recruiting officer he can offer them something of interest.

The suggestion that ought to be made in the interest of economy is that the entire job of recruiting personnel for the armed services should be left to the local draft boards. If it were, credits for volunteers could be adjusted each month. It is a known fact that there is a lag between the time an enlistment takes place and when the draft board gets credit for the enlistment.

After a draft board has sent out its preinduction notices, if the recruiting service comes along and succeeds in herding boys into the service by this kind of solicitation, the draft board must go through its work again and send out other notices in order to meet its quota. Furthermore, the board does not get credit for its volunteers until several months thereafter. If the recruiting were handled by the local draft boards, they could accept volunteers, and thus save a great deal of money on this expensive recruiting program.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from South Dakota has brought out a very salient point. This morning I received a message that the chairman of a certain draft board had resigned his position because of the very point which has been made by the Senator from South Dakota. It seems to me that the spending of millions of dollars for propaganda purposes by the armed services is entirely unwarranted and has very little to do with securing the number of men necessary to keep the Army up to proper strength.

Mr. CASE. Under date of July 19, 1951, I received a letter from Anna M. Rosenberg, Assistant Secretary of Defense, which gives the number of persons who are engaged in recruiting at the present time—Army and Air Force, 9,260; Navy, 3,324; Marine Corps, 1,793. The total number of persons engaged in recruiting at the present time is 14,377. The recruiting could be handled through the local draft boards on a volunteer basis. I believe that the boys should have an opportunity to volunteer if they want to do so.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. This is one of several subjects which the committee and its members have had under consideration with the Department, and I can report to the Senate that as a result of some of our conversations a reevaluation of the enlistment program is now in process. It may be that it can be cut down. As I stated on the opening day, I personally feel that in many instances there is overstaffing of various departments. I assure the Senator from South Dakota that in the hearings which the committee held day after day, from the 7th of June to the 28th of August, it was not possible to go into every contract which may have been made. We intend to pursue that subject. It is my purpose to call several branches of the armed services before us for further detailed statements of the steps they are taking to reduce expenditures in the matter of personnel.

Assistant Secretary Anna Rosenberg, who was appointed at the request of the retiring Secretary of Defense, General Marshall, whose praises rang through

this Chamber this morning, has undertaken by directive to every branch of the armed services to make personnel cuts. An order for a 5-percent cut was issued.

I know that I speak for the whole committee when I say that the committee will continue to press for the utmost economy in these expenditures. It ought to be clear that we labor under a very heavy handicap when a basic policy for the armed services is prescribed by a legislative committee and the Appropriations Committee then undertakes to review appropriations which are made to carry out the mandate of Congress.

Of course, it is true that the Appropriations Committee at any time and that Congress at any time can say "We will not appropriate X dollars for this project or for that project. So much is authorized for this project, but the expenditures in our opinion should be thus and so." This committee has done that in numerous instances. I wish to assure the Senator that the committee has not been derelict in its scrutiny of these appropriations.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I realize how impossible it is for the Appropriations Committee, with the limited number of employees at its command, to keep up with the thousands of statisticians and other persons who are employed by Government agencies in attempting to secure the largest possible appropriations from the Congress.

I raise this point of the unnecessary expenditures by the Armed Forces at levels and amounts which we nonprofessionals can more easily understand because it seems to me that if unnecessary expenditures are occurring at the lower levels and in the lesser amounts, there is no reason to believe that the same agencies would be any more careful in regard to the larger amounts which may be made available to them.

I am happy that the Senator from Wyoming has indicated his intention to keep hammering on this line, and to squeeze out the unnecessary and wasteful expenditures.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That certainly will be my purpose.

Let me point out that one of the members of the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee is also the chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments; I refer to the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN]. He and the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. MOODY] have introduced a bill, one purpose of which is to expand the staff of the Appropriations Committee so that it may supervise these expenditures.

All I have to say to the Senator from Vermont is, have a heart for the labors of the chairman of the Armed Services Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, whose nose has been on this grindstone without interruption since the 7th day of June of this year, seeking in every way known to him to interrogate every witness who came before the committee, and to spread upon the record the fullest possible information as to the manner in which the money of the people of the United States is being expended.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wish to assure the Senator from Wyoming that I do have a heart and a great deal of sympathy for the chairmen of the subcommittees and the chairmen of the full committees of the Senate.

I wish it fully understood, however, that my remarks are not to be understood in any way as advocating a great expansion of the staffs of the committees of the Congress, because some the committees already have larger staffs than they need.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the printed hearings on this bill run to 1,910 pages. I call attention to that fact because anyone who has ever dealt with appropriation bill hearings knows that 1,910 pages of testimony cannot be taken in connection with an appropriation bill without having the nose of the chairman of the subcommittee handling the bill to the grindstone for a long, long time.

Another aspect to be considered in connection with a military appropriation bill is that a great deal of the testimony taken in regard to such a bill—testimony in regard to the Army, the Air Force, and the Navy—is off the record, with the result that the printed record of the hearings on such a bill is only a part of the entire story, and much more than appears in the printed record is given off the record, for much of the material submitted to the committee is composed of classified tables, charts, and so forth. Therefore, the printed hearings do not anywhere nearly tell the full story.

No one who reads the RECORD of these debates should in any way receive the impression that the Members of the Senate are in any way unappreciative of the long labors and the diligent work done by the committee. I take off my hat to the subcommittee, which has taken 1,910 printed pages of hearings, as well as great amounts of testimony and information which have been received off the record.

At the same time, Mr. President, it is the responsibility of the Members of the Senate to request such information as occurs to them to be proper for consideration in connection with an appropriation bill. In speaking at this time, following the remarks made by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], I wish to call attention to the fact that 14,377 persons employed in the recruiting service constitute a fairly good-sized division. Of course, it is true that many of those who are engaged in the Recruiting Service are either disabled veterans or are soldiers who have disability of some sort or another which makes them unavailable for service in the field. But that such persons are available for and are engaged in the recruiting service is evidence of the fact that they are also suitable for almost any type of office work elsewhere, and in such work they might very well replace many members of the Armed Forces who have been placed in the service by the draft boards; and in that way the number of those engaged in the active field service might be considerably increased.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment inserting a proviso at the

bottom of page 18 and the top of page 19.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have an amendment directed to this section of the bill, on pages 17 and 18, but referring to the entire rate of appropriations in the various lines. If this committee amendment is adopted, I wonder whether it then would be out of order for me to submit my amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, if I may make a statement, let me say that I feel that adoption of this committee amendment would not interfere at all with the amendment the Senator from Illinois intends to submit, for the amendment now before us is a limitation upon the appropriation. The amendment raising the sum to \$194,000,000 has already been adopted for the third time, but I shall be glad, after we have completed the committee amendments, to ask unanimous consent, if it should be necessary, that any additional amendment the Senator may wish to offer may be considered. The question, Mr. President, is on the proviso beginning in line 23. I thought that had been adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment which was passed over, on page 18, line 22.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment passed over will be stated.

The next amendment passed over was, under the subhead "Departmental salaries and expenses—Salaries, Department of the Army," on page 34, line 11, after the word "service", to strike out "\$3,625,000" and insert "\$3,723,400."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, does the same understanding apply as to this amendment?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; it goes right on through the bill. I have seen some of the amendments offered by the Senator from Illinois, and when they are presented, I want the Senator to have an opportunity for full discussion. There will be no effort to shut off or to prevent discussion.

A day or so ago the Senator from South Dakota desired an explanation of various increases which are made on this page. I shall be very happy to explain them, amendment by amendment, or to explain them all en bloc, whichever may seem desirable.

The \$98,000 which we added for the Office of the Secretary of the Army is for the specific purpose of enabling the Secretary to carry on the renegotiation program. There has already been a 5-percent reduction in civilian personnel, and the request was for the restoration of a sum sufficient to provide 12 additional negotiators in the Armed Services Renegotiation Board. The Board, with this increase, will have a staff of less than 35, which, compared with the staff of renegotiators in World War II, represents a very great reduction. At that time there were as many as 150 persons employed in the renegotiation. Our committee felt that there was no ques-

tion about the wisdom and economy of allowing the additional personnel, to carry on the renegotiation of these vast contracts.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the Senator from South Dakota is the one who introduced the word "renegotiation" into the Federal statutes dealing with excess profits.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is to be complimented on that provision.

Mr. CASE. He would therefore hardly be in a position to object to a provision to provide the required number of renegotiators, but it seems to me it is important to have the increases in the bill explained, so the record will be clear as to what they are for. I would ask the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, did not the House provide any funds for personnel for the renegotiation staff of the Price Adjustment Board?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The estimate for this purpose was \$3,723,400. The House committee cut the appropriation to \$3,625,000, and the committee felt that that cut was unwarranted.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, scarcely any money can be expended which will return larger dividends than the money spent for the purpose of providing a sufficient number of members of the renegotiation staff, through whose work we shall undoubtedly get back some big returns.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That was the feeling.

Mr. CASE. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The next passed over amendment will be stated.

The next amendment passed over was, on page 34, line 15, to strike out "\$700,000" and insert "\$743,000."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, with respect to this amendment, I again point out that the Congress, by the enactment of a law, imposed additional burdens and duties and responsibilities upon the Department of the Army. In the Eighty-first Congress, Public Law 506 was passed, which provides new appellate procedures for military personnel and enlisted personnel. There was a feeling that the judicial system of the military forces should be revised, and that enlisted personnel, haled before courts martial, should have an opportunity for a more clearly defined appellate procedure, so that they would have a clear opportunity to present their cases. The Judge Advocate General appeared before the committee and satisfied it that the restoration of \$43,000 was entirely justified. The increasing strength of the military department seemed to make this essential.

The 1952 estimate was \$761,000; the House cut it to \$700,000, a reduction of \$61,000, and we have restored \$43,000, solely for the purpose of implementing this appellate procedure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 34, line 15.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the pending bill, House bill 5054. My amendment would create

a watchdog committee to check upon the expenditure of military appropriations. Mr. President \$61,000,000,000 is a tremendous sum. I doubt whether any person or any group can rightfully determine whether an appropriation of that magnitude is the exact amount which the military should have. But I believe that if we have a proper inspection of how the funds are expended, we might in that manner safeguard this appropriation and safeguard the taxpayers against unwise expenditures by any of the military forces. We would then know definitely that if there were an expenditure either for this or that purpose, which exceeded the necessities of the case, or was not in line with common sense, we could immediately stop the military from making the expenditure, and have an accounting. In my opinion, such an investigation, such watchdog activities over the expenditure of the \$61,000,000,000 and any additional funds which may be appropriated for the military, would have a wholesome effect upon those who are charged with the responsibility of spending such huge sums of money.

The proposed committee is in line with the watchdog committee in existence during World War II, known as the Truman committee. I know how that committee proceeded to examine the installations and to determine how Federal funds were expended for military purposes during those years, and it had a most wholesome effect on keeping expenditures within the bounds of good common sense.

So, Mr. President, I offer this amendment in order that it may lie on the table until such time as we shall have completed the consideration of the committee amendments, and I would then like to have it taken up for consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and printed and will lie on the table.

Mr. THYE. I should say that the amendment is offered for myself and the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THYE. I shall be most happy to yield.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I wonder if the distinguished Senator from Minnesota would consent to have the junior Senator from New Jersey associate himself with the two other Senators in offering this amendment and with its purposes.

Mr. THYE. I should be delighted to have the junior Senator from New Jersey associated with us. Last May I offered the same legislative proposal in the form of a resolution. I have not been able to obtain action on the resolution, and it is for that reason that I now offer it as an amendment to the pending bill.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THYE. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it the same provision which was submitted with reference to a staff for the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. THYE. Yes. It provides for a "watchdog" committee created through

the Appropriations Committee. We would then have a staff of qualified auditors who could proceed to determine how the funds were expended. Personally, as a member of the committee, I find myself of the conviction that it is very difficult for members of the committee to familiarize themselves with all the items in an appropriation bill. Therefore, as a member of the subcommittee and of the full Committee on Appropriations, I find it necessary to approve certain amendments, even though I recognize there is a need for economy in Federal expenditures. I question whether anyone on the committee is wise enough to say whether the appropriation for this or that activity of the Defense Department is in excess of what is actually required, but I believe that if we had proper investigation and inspection in connection with how the funds are expended, we would safeguard ourselves against appropriating funds in excess of what would be fair and necessary in developing our national defense in such manner as to assure us of security against an invading enemy or against any military aggression on the part of an enemy.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan has been in sympathy with the idea of having a staff which could properly supervise some of the activities of government in order that the Appropriations Committee might understand, from the legislative point of view, what is going on and how the money is being expended. I have advocated it many times, not only in the committee, with the Senator from Minnesota, but on the floor of the Senate.

Personally, I should like to associate my name with the Senator's amendment, because I feel that it is very urgent that such a committee be formed in order that we may do a better job in connection with appropriations. As the amount of the appropriations increases—and I am sure the chairman of the subcommittee holds the same view, as he indicated there is another bill to increase the size of the service, and so forth—we shall need all the help and assistance we can get in the committee in order that we may bring the facts to the people.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, as a member of the Subcommittee on the Armed Services of the Committee on Appropriations, of which subcommittee the Senator from Wyoming is chairman, I attended most of the committee sessions, and I wish to say that the subcommittee chairman could not have been more searching in the questions he asked of the various representatives of the military, the Atomic Energy Commission, and others who appeared before the committee, in an endeavor to find whether there was any possibility of reducing the budget requests. I would say that all who had the opportunity to be in attendance at the committee sessions were most appreciative and were willing to offer their thanks to the chairman of the subcommittee for the splendid job he was doing in endeavoring to ascertain whether the appropriations should be reduced below the budget recommendation. I know that when the final recommendations came from

the subcommittee there was not one item in the appropriation bill which had not had complete study in an effort to ascertain whether it represented the bare minimum that should be allowed.

Personally, I could not make any suggestion as to how we should reduce the items in the appropriation bill and, at the same time, assure ourselves that we were developing a national defense which would provide security for the Nation in the event an aggressor started an action which would injure the welfare of the people of the Nation. I feel that I must vote against amendments proposing a reduction in certain items, because I believe it is necessary that we should develop a national defense which is adequate and which will prevent any aggressor from inaugurating any movement which would bring on world war III. If our enemies know we are strong, they will fear to start any action against us, but when we appropriate such a sum as \$61,000,000,000, we need to inspect and investigate every dollar expended.

I recall that the able and distinguished Senator from Michigan called to our attention offices which had been so elaborately decorated that it bordered almost on the ridiculous. That was during World War II. We do not want a recurrence of any such expenditures. I believe it would have a most wholesome effect upon all who have the responsibility of expending funds, if it were known that there was a committee of the Senate as proposed by my amendment, that would examine the records and books to ascertain whether the funds had been unwisely expended, and that if they had been unwisely expended, there would have to be an accounting made. That would have a wholesome effect on those who have charge of exercising economy in expenditures. I think it would save the country a great deal of money in the course of the next 2 years while we are so greatly expanding appropriations for our national defense.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from Minnesota for his remarks. He sat diligently, for long hours, listening to the testimony which was presented to the subcommittee. I am very grateful for the sentiments which the Senator has just expressed.

Mr. THYE. The Senator from Wyoming had those statements duly and rightfully coming to him.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THYE. I yield.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Minnesota for his very objective and worth-while effort, and to express the hope that when his amendment is considered it will receive the overwhelming support of the Senate, because, as the Senator has well said, the appropriation involves approximately \$61,000,000,000, and if we approve any substantial part of that amount we must be very careful as to how the money is expended in order to be sure that every cent is properly accounted for.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I am most happy to know that the senior Senator

from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] would like to join with me as a cosponsor of my amendment to the bill.

Mr. FERGUSON. I thank the distinguished Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment of the committee passed over will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 34, line 18, after the word "General," it is proposed to strike out "\$9,625,000" and insert "\$9,875,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment passed over will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On the same page, in line 20, after the word "Transportation," it is proposed to strike out "\$3,800,000" and insert "\$4,024,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, may we have a statement about that amendment? It relates to the Office of the Chief of Transportation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, this amendment has to do with the Office of the Chief of Transportation of the Department of the Army. It should be understood that the task of the Chief of Transportation is one of the largest and most onerous that is carried by any member of the armed services. The transportation involves the shipment of material by rail, by motor, by air, by inland waterway, and by all combined systems of transportation. It is a world-wide activity. The number of loadings during fiscal year 1951 amounted to 1,057,000. The number of short tons transported amounted to 10,572,000. This will have to be increased during the fiscal year 1952. The figure proposed by the Senate committee is an increase of \$224,000 over the figure approved by the House. The estimate was for \$4,024,373. The House allowed \$3,800,000. Our committee added a sufficient amount to make the sum \$4,024,000. This will allow for 60 positions in the office of the Chief of Transportation which, as the general in command aptly said, is the nerve center of our world-wide transportation system.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 34, line 20.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment passed over will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 35, line 1, after the word "Ordnance", it is proposed to strike out "\$6,500,000" and insert "\$6,750,000."

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I noted with considerable interest that the one point in the bill at which the Senate committee proposed a reduction was in Ordnance Service and Supplies. That was the notable exception to all the other changes in the bill. The other changes were all increases. Under "Ordnance service and supplies," the House had recommended \$3,307,500,000,

and the Senate committee proposed \$8,076,056,430, or a reduction of \$231,443,570 below the House figure. Now, however, in dealing with these special funds for the departmental salaries, there is proposed an increase of \$250,000 above the House figure. It is a little difficult for me to understand why the funds for the salaries should be increased by a quarter of a million dollars, whereas the funds for the Ordnance Service itself were reduced by \$231,000,000. I should like to have an explanation on that point.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am very glad to supply it. The reduction in the appropriation for ordnance, to which the Senator has referred, is the one to which I made allusion yesterday and again earlier today. We reduced the appropriation for ordnance \$200,000,000-plus by eliminating a certain item of procurement. It had nothing to do with personnel. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], who is the ranking Republican member of the committee, and the Senator from Wyoming felt, upon examination, or upon hearing the testimony, that there was a particular item, an armored personnel carrier, which might very well be eliminated for the present until it had received further study. So we eliminated that item. That is merely a cut in procurement. But the huge expenditure for ordnance still requires a substantial force to handle the work. The 1952 estimate for the departmental salaries for this objective was \$6,867,000. The House committee reduced that to \$6,500,000. The Department of the Army requested the restoration of the full amount of the cut, namely, \$367,000. The Senate committee, instead of restoring the full amount, added \$250,000. So that we are granting less than was requested. They asked for 89 positions, and we are giving them about 60.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. UNDERWOOD in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 35, line 1.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment passed over will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 43, line 19, after the word "expended", it is proposed to strike out "\$50,414,000" and to insert "\$51,657,000", of which \$1,243,000 shall be used for construction, installation, or repair of sewage facilities at the naval base, Newport, Rhode Island, and the remainder shall be available."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the amendment? What was the estimate for this item?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I have agreed with the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], who wanted to make some remarks at this point, that if he would refrain from taking the floor until after these departmental items had been handled I would be glad, as always, to listen to him; and if the Senator from South Dakota will agree, I think we

should wait now until the Senator from Washington has made the comments he desires to make.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I am very grateful for what the Senator from Wyoming has just said. I would defer now in order that the explanation requested by the Senator from South Dakota might be given.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I shall be very happy to make the explanation. On the floor with me are the Senators from Rhode Island, our distinguished and very able friend, the senior Senator from that State [Mr. GREEN], and our distinguished and very able friend, the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE].

For several years there has been a serious situation with respect to the Navy yard at Newport. The sewage system there has been the source of very great pollution in those waters. On numerous occasions, the Senators from Rhode Island have sought to have an appropriation which would enable the Department of the Navy to construct the works which ought to be provided to reduce the pollution. But there never was a budget estimate for the item. There was always delay. It was pointed out, when we talked about naval pollution, that the city of Newport itself was discharging sewage into the bay. As a result of this situation, which is harmful to the health of all who use these waters, military personnel and civilian personnel, the matter has been delayed for several years.

Last year, however, Congress passed an authorization bill for public works which included an authorization to carry out the program of removing this pollution. In the meantime the community of Newport, the State of Rhode Island itself, and certain subdivisions, as I understand, have themselves taken steps which the Senators from Rhode Island can explain in greater detail than I can, to attack this problem.

So now for the first time we have a joint operation between the Navy and the communities of Rhode Island to prevent this pollution. The representatives of the Navy appeared and testified before the committee and supported the amendment, but the chairman of the subcommittee must acknowledge that there is no budget estimate for this sum.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Did I correctly understand the chairman of the subcommittee to say that this item was included in an authorization bill passed last year?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Mr. CASE. It is not in the new public works bill, is it?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No. It is in the bill passed on June 27 of last year, as I understand.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 43, beginning in line 19.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment passed over.

The next committee amendment passed over was, under the heading "Reserve personnel requirements," on page 52, line 25, to strike out the "\$17,543,000", and insert "\$19,843,000."

GEN. GEORGE C. MARSHALL

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, Gen. George C. Marshall has resigned as Secretary of Defense. At the risk of being misunderstood—and I gladly run this risk—I want to let it be known that the announcement of General Marshall's resignation is extremely good news to the junior Senator from Washington. There is no personal prejudice, antagonism, or animosity in this feeling. I am officially, and as a citizen, deeply gratified to know that a distinguished soldier is leaving an assignment which no soldier should ever be selected to fill. Being advised that a civilian is to replace a soldier as the Secretary of Defense, I am moved to say to the Nation that their interests will be better managed and protected in the future.

The appointment of General Marshall to be Secretary of Defense was confirmed by the Senate of the United States on September 20, 1950. I worked against that nomination in the Armed Services Committee and I voted against that nomination in the Senate. My reason for so doing was, to my mind, both understandable and sound.

At no time did I say anything about General Marshall in the Senate which I did not say in General Marshall's presence within the committee. In both situations, I said the same thing; and I wish to repeat in literal form what I did say to General Marshall when he was called before the Armed Services Committee of the Senate less than a year ago.

The reference is to be found on page 15178 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 20, 1950.

Mr. Chairman, there is but one observation I wish to make in the presence of General Marshall and the committee. I want to say to General Marshall that because he is a professional military man, and I like to point out that he is one of the most distinguished persons in the annals of American military history, who has been nominated for the post of Secretary of Defense, which I believe completely should be filled by a civilian, there is absolutely nothing I can or would do to secure this post for General Marshall. If General Marshall was a combination, which no man could possibly be, of the finest characteristics and abilities of Alexander, Caesar, Napoleon, Wellington, Grant, Lee, Foch, Pershing, Eisenhower, and Bradley, I would not vote to confirm General Marshall as Secretary of Defense. In my opinion, America will not solve her problems by endeavoring to find a soldier, old or young, to carry out burdens which ought to be borne and conquered by civilian citizens. I wish, however, to state directly to General Marshall, that should the Armed Services Committee favor your nomination and if the Senate confirms it, as seems most likely, the Senator from Washington will stand always ready to be of assistance to your responsibilities in every conceivable way. On the assumption that you, General Marshall, will shortly become America's Secretary of Defense, I wish you well, sound health, and long life.

Since General Marshall took office on September 20, 1950, the Senator from

Washington has been sympathetic to General Marshall's burdens and sought to lighten those burdens as best he could.

I did, however, become more and more concerned because a military man was occupying a post which could only adequately be filled by a civilian. General Marshall's overriding weakness as Secretary of Defense was a weakness over which he had no control. His life had been devoted to the military. He had been a soldier. He was a soldier. He will live out his years and die as a soldier. A good soldier, as General Marshall was, is a good citizen, but there are assignments which are beyond the capacity and training of any soldier. The post of Secretary of Defense is such an assignment.

I lived a lifetime in the 7 weeks of hearings conducted by the joint committee on the dismissal of General MacArthur and the military situation in the Far East. It was my business to study and constructively analyze the relationship of the Secretary of Defense to the Military Establishment. This study increased my conviction that no military man should ever attempt to be the civilian head of the Department of Defense. It became obvious to me that the Joint Chiefs of Staff were to the Secretary of Defense what the general staff of a division, corps, or army is to the commanding general of those units. Nothing could be worse if our determination is to achieve and maintain a healthy balance between military and civilian interests within our Defense Establishment. When the Secretary of State and the Joint Chiefs of Staff concurred in the President's ambition to dismiss General of the Army Douglas MacArthur without referring the question to the civilian Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, it was an admission that the Secretary of Defense had no understanding of the need for civilian control over the military. The Secretary of Defense, without any intention to create harm, ignored and treated those civilian Secretaries as though they were administrative subordinates and messenger boys. The Congress of the United States never determined all of the reasons involved in the dismissal of General MacArthur because the civilian Secretaries within the Defense Establishment were totally uninformed.

I trust that General Marshall will benefit from health and happiness in the years of his retirement. I wish him well as a person but, with what I conceive to be the best interests of my Nation in mind, I can only cheer because he has gone from an assignment in which he found himself beyond his depth.

The Senate confirmed the appointment of Gen. George Marshall to be the Secretary of Defense because the Senate, less than a year ago, considered him to be an indispensable man. The Senate rewrote the law of the land to make his appointment possible. That special law has outworn its usefulness in less than 1 year. I pray, Mr. President, that the Senate of the United States will never again consider any human being

to be indispensable, for history tells us—and we ought to know it to be a fact—that no individual is or can ever be indispensable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 52, line 25.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment passed over was, on page 57, line 22, after the word "tuition", to insert "specifically approved by the Secretary of the Department concerned and."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair). The Senator will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senate is considering the amendment on page 57. May I inquire what disposition was made of the amendment on page 55, beginning in line 17?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment was agreed to yesterday.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The amendment to strike the House provision was agreed to?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; with the explicit statement on behalf of members of the subcommittee, and other Senators who discussed the bill, that this whole problem will be reopened and thoroughly searched in conference. The Members of the Committee on Appropriations are definitely of the feeling that there must be an improvement in the handling of the reservists, and we intend to work it out with the House managers to the best of our ability.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 57, line 22.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In connection with this amendment I believe the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] had an amendment which he desired to offer. I therefore ask that consideration of the amendment go over until the Senator from Virginia can be called to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, consideration of the amendment will be postponed.

The next amendment passed over was, on page 69, after line 13, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 630. In order more effectively to administer the programs and functions of the Department of Defense, the President, to the extent he deems it necessary and appropriate in the interest of national defense, may authorize, within the Office of the Secretary of Defense, 15 temporary positions to be placed in grades GS-17 and GS-18 of the general schedule of the Classification Act of 1949 in accordance with the procedures and standards of that act. Not more than eight of these positions shall be in grade GS-18. Such positions shall be additional to the number authorized by section 505 of that act.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, that section went over, because I believe the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] had planned to offer an amendment with respect to it.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan is a cosponsor of the amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I believe the Senator from Michigan has reference to another amendment. The Senator from Virginia, after consultation, was satisfied with this amendment as it stands.

Mr. FERGUSON. Would the Senator from Wyoming like to go back to the other amendment?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have asked that it be passed over until the Senator from Virginia arrives in the Chamber. If we can now dispose of the pending amendment, since there seems to be complete agreement on it, we shall go back to the other amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Is the Senator from Wyoming referring now to the insertion of a new section 630?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I shall reserve a point of order and make it at the proper time.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is subject to a point of order. If the point of order is raised, after an explanation of the amendment, I shall have only one recourse, namely, to move to suspend the rule. I am hopeful that the Senator from Illinois may find the explanation which is offered on behalf of the committee as being adequate for his purpose.

The purpose of the amendment is to enable the Department of Defense to carry on the greatly increased burdens of the Department in its efforts to handle the tremendous program of procurement for the three services which has been thrust upon the Department by the appropriations of 1951 and the new appropriations in this bill. The staff of the Department of Defense, to my certain knowledge, has been working long hours of overtime without additional compensation. The purpose is to add 15 temporary positions in the higher grades, so that the Secretary of Defense may have the assistance of highly qualified persons from civilian life who will add to the managerial competency of the Department. In order to make certain that these will not result in a permanent change in the law we have inserted the words "temporary positions," because the subject is presently under consideration by the appropriate legislative committee.

Deputy Secretary Lovett, then Acting Secretary of Defense, submitted a letter to the committee under date of August 28, which I shall be very glad to put into the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Chairman, Armed Services Subcommittee,
Committee on Appropriations,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: We at the Department of Defense are becoming increasingly aware of our need for outstanding personnel in the higher grades and do not feel that we can wait to get appointing authority for them until over-all revisions to the Classification Act, which have been discussed for

a long time, may be enacted. Rather, we request that language be inserted in the 1952 appropriations act of the Department of Defense to permit the assignment to the Office of the Secretary of Defense of an additional 15 super grades, 8 in the grade of GS-18 and 7 in the grade of GS-17.

The Department feels that these permanent authorities should be authorized to us now, and is agreeable that they should be temporary insofar as their relationship to a later total is concerned, either being repealed whenever there is an over-all amendment to the Classification Act which may increase the authorized positions, or being subtracted from any allocation given to the Department of Defense by subsequent laws.

Within the Department of Defense, including the Department of the Army, Department of the Navy, and the Department of the Air Force, there are only 135 super grades including P-9 scientists. Of this total 103 have been allocated to the three military departments, with 32 allocated to the Office of the Secretary of Defense. Of those 32, 17 are temporary authorities under the Defense Production Act, and are concentrated in the Munitions Board on procurement positions, and in the areas of manpower and personnel under Assistant Secretary Rosenberg. Another seven (including five P-9 scientists) are in the Research and Development Board.

As a result only eight positions (one GS-18, two GS-17's, and five GS-16's) are available for the varied responsibilities of our immediate Office and for all other agencies formally established as a part of the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

The areas of responsibility which are suffering most from the lack of job authorities at the present time are concerned with top-level legal assistance in various fields, foreign military aid, fiscal, budget, procurement and contract matters, international relations, production financing, and various matters allied thereto.

Provided these positions are authorized, it is expected that no more than 40 percent of them will be filled by promotions from within, and that the balance of them will be filled by employment of skilled and qualified personnel from other agencies or from outside the Government. The types of responsibilities which it is contemplated these officials will have and the caliber of the people we hope to get are such that it is mandatory that these salary opportunities be available. Otherwise, not only will we not be able to fill the newly created positions but we will find increasing numbers of our own key people leaving us for more attractive offers from outside the Government, and for positions within the Government where the temporary agencies have more opportunities to offer them.

Without the proposed authorities we will be forced to fill these positions with less capable people, and also may find an increasing tendency on the part of our own key officials to look to the temporary agencies or to private business for salary opportunities which are denied them as employees of this permanent agency which has the primary responsibility in the field of national defense.

At the present time, although the Department of Defense is by far the largest of the operating defense agencies, it suffers a considerable comparative disadvantage in employment conditions in the top civilian managerial positions when considered in relationship to the temporary defense agencies. This disadvantage is one which seems to be increasing rather than leveling off as each new agency gets statutory authority for additional top-level jobs. A table summarizing the planned employment in various of the so-called other defense agencies is attached by way of illustration.

The Department of Defense proposal for the small number of additional GS-18 and GS-17 grades for the Office of the Secretary

of Defense requested herein has been discussed with the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, who interposes no objection to the presentation of this proposal to the Congress for its consideration and action.

Enclosed is a proposed amendment to the general provisions of the Department of Defense fiscal year 1952 appropriation act which would give effect to this request.

If these positions are authorized, it is contemplated that they will be filled only on the personal approval of the Secretary or Deputy Secretary of Defense, and that their purpose will be to increase the top-level civilian managerial talent of the Department in the general areas discussed herein.

With kindest regards, I am,

Very sincerely yours,

ROBERT A. LOVETT,
Acting Secretary.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Illinois will not raise the point of order. I give him the assurance of the whole committee that this subject, like the one just under discussion, will be carefully reviewed in conference. I may say that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] has been checking on this matter, and the Senator from Michigan likewise. We have a complete understanding among the three of us that in the present situation we ought to allow these temporary 15 positions.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. In the first place, temporary positions have a rather intriguing way of becoming permanent positions. After they are set up as temporary positions they harden into permanent positions. I am frank to say that I do not know what a temporary position is. Normally one would think that it would be for the life of an appropriation, namely, 1 year, or at the outside for 2 years. But they are carried on and on and on, and finally they are made permanent, and the jobs are there to stay. These positions are for grades GS-17 and GS-18. If they are related to procurement functions, it seems to me the committee ought to write a date line into the amendment, so as to cut off the positions at the end of the year.

I certainly would not make the point of order if there were some assurance that at the end of a year's time these positions would lapse. However, from long experience I know what happens in connection with positions of this kind, and therefore I would feel constrained to make the point of order unless the bill carried more safeguarding language than it carries at the present time.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Then, Mr. President, to the amendment I offer the following amendment: On page 69, at the end of line 18, after the word "positions", insert "for the fiscal year 1952."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I shall not make the point of order, on the basis of the amendatory language the Senator has just submitted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming to the committee amendment, on page 69 in line 18.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment previously passed over will be stated.

The next committee amendment passed over was, on page 71, in line 7, to insert:

SEC. 632. No funds appropriated in titles II, III, IV, and V of this act shall be used for the payment in excess of 530,000 full-time graded civilian employees at any one time during the current fiscal year.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, this committee amendment probably calls for the suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

We now have completed all the committee amendments which have previously been passed over; but there is a matter which the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] may wish to discuss, and I know there is a matter which the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] desires to discuss.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I shall be glad to call up the amendment identified as "9-10-51-I," which was submitted by the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] for himself and the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is on page 57, in line 22, I believe.

Mr. FERGUSON. No; it is on page 71, in line 9.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Does the Senator from Michigan feel that there should be a quorum call before that matter is brought up? I wish to be perfectly fair to all Senators who have indicated an interest in the amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is quite all right.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator will refer now to the amendment on page 57, in line 22, he will find that he and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] have an amendment to it; and on behalf of the subcommittee, I shall be very glad to accept their amendment to the committee amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is not that amendment on page 58, in line 2? The printed amendment is identified as "9-10-51-J." The amendment would be inserted before the period in line 2, on page 58 of the bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Michigan is quite correct. That is a general proviso to be added at the end of that section.

Therefore, before the amendment is offered, I shall ask that the committee amendment on page 57 be agreed to. This amendment provides a limitation upon the payment of tuition for employees, by requiring the specific approval of the Secretary of the Department concerned before it can be done.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The other amendment is broader, and ought to be in the bill.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator from Wyoming wish to have a vote taken on the amendment at this time?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes, I ask that the amendment be acted upon at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 57, in lines 22 and 23, which has previously been stated.

Is there objection? Hearing none, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. BYRD subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier today the Senator from Wyoming accepted and the Senate adopted an amendment to the committee amendment on page 57, line 22. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, immediately after the adoption of the amendment, a statement which I have prepared with reference to the subject involved.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD TUITION

This amendment deals with the abuse, particularly by the Air Force, of funds which were provided primarily for paying the tuition of scientific and technical personnel at higher institutions of learning (scientific and technical schools, MIT, etc.), where it is deemed to be necessary in order that this caliber of personnel may keep abreast of rapidly developing scientific and technical subjects.

The Air Force was found to be using these funds to pay not only the salaries but also the tuitions of totally unqualified people in business colleges where they were learning to be file clerks, typists, and stenographers.

Under the broad terms of the language in previous appropriation bills this was found to be not illegal, except in one respect. There is no civil-service job description to cover an employee whose sole activity for the Government is that of being a student.

A check at the Civil Service Commission will reveal this to be an accurate statement in its substance. And if it is indicated, I believe the Comptroller General will be fully justified in attempting to recover from responsible disbursing officers sums expended in a manner that was contemplated at the Wright-Patterson Air Force Base.

The committee has recognized this situation, and attempted in a degree to cure it with committee amendment language to be found in lines 22 and 23 on page 57. The language simply provides wherever funds provided in this act are used to pay tuition approval of the Secretary of the department concerned is required.

This is all right so far as it goes; but it does not go far enough. The principal difficulty in personnel problems of the Defense Establishment have their roots in the fact that personnel administration is too greatly diffused and decentralized to allow effective restrictions from departmental levels at Washington.

This amendment in effect provides that no tuition may be paid out of any funds appropriated in this or prior Defense Establishment appropriation acts for persons in jobs which pay less than the rate for GS (Government service) 5.

The Civil Service Commission advises that no scientific or technical personnel in either junior or senior grades are paid below this level. In effect the amendment precludes the payment of tuition for file clerks, stenographers and typists who, generally speaking, are either paid below this grade or have reached a proficiency where additional education for this purpose is not required.

Thus, this amendment would provide for the refresher courses for technical and scientific personnel in a manner that was originally offered as justification for this general provision in appropriation bills. It was never intended to pay tuition in order to qualify people to take positions at the very bottom of the civil-service classification schedule where the requirements are at the very minimum.

NOTE.—This amendment is written to apply to funds available from appropriations contained in this act and funds available from prior appropriation acts for the Defense Establishment.

Its application to prior appropriation acts may be argued to be "legislative" and therefore subject to a point of order. If desired, this particular language may be deleted from the amendment. It was put in primarily because appropriations are being enacted for the Defense Establishment around the calendar and actually there is a great deal of money available to the Defense Establishment not provided for in this act.

NOTE.—This amendment is to the general provisions of the bill, but it is designed to override similar provisions in the appropriation language for the respective departments. With respect to the Air Force, it seems to make little sense to allow funds appropriated for maintenance and operation of the Air Force to be used to pay tuition for student typists at a business college.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I now call up the amendment identified as "9-10-51-J," which is submitted by the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], on behalf of himself and myself. As I understand, the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee is willing to accept the amendment and take it to conference.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; I shall be very glad to do so.

Mr. President, the Senator from Virginia has just come to the floor. Let me say that the Senator from Michigan has just presented the amendment which the Senator from Virginia discussed yesterday with the chairman of the subcommittee. I am indicating, as I indicated to the Senator from Virginia, that I am very happy to accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would like to inform the Senator from Wyoming that the committee amendment in line 7, on page 71, has not yet been agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is the amendment which I said should go over until we have a quorum call.

In the meantime, I wish to dispose of the amendment submitted by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], on behalf of himself and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON]; and then I wish to permit the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] to make the comment he wishes to make.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will ask the clerk to state the amendment submitted by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] on behalf of himself and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 58, before the period in line 2, it is proposed to insert a colon and the following: "Provided, That no appropriation contained in this act, and no funds available from prior appropriations to component departments and agencies of the

Department of Defense, shall be used to pay tuition or to make other payments to educational institutions in connection with the instruction or training of employees receiving, or prospective employees who will receive, compensation at a rate below the minimum rate of pay for positions allocated to grade GS-5 under the Classification Act of 1949, as amended."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am very glad to accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, if the distinguished Senator from Wyoming will yield to me in a rather general way, there are some questions which I should like to address to him upon a subject which I have already discussed with him and with other Senators, with the staff of the committee, and with some of the personnel of the Defense Department. So if the Senator from Wyoming will yield at this time for a rather general discussion, I shall appreciate his doing so.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am very happy, indeed, to yield to the Senator from Florida, and I am glad he is bringing up that matter.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, when I noted the exact wording of the report of the Appropriations Committee relative to this bill, and later when I noted in 12 places in the bill certain wording, not always alike, but always raising the same question which I shall mention, I discussed the matter with the Senator from Wyoming. I believe we were in accord that the best way to straighten out the matter would be to bring it to the floor, for some discussion.

The distinguished Senator from Wyoming is, of course, thoroughly familiar and has shown complete familiarity with a certain provision of the Constitution which has existed as a part of the Constitution from the very beginning of our country. I refer to the constitutional provision relative to appropriations for the Army. That provision is found in paragraph 12 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution; and it has been in the Constitution always, has never been changed, and has never been the subject matter of any decision by the Supreme Court, and therefore there is no chance to measure its meaning against any judicial interpretation.

The provision to which I refer comes in a section which has to do with the power of the Congress. It reads as follows:

The Congress shall have power—

And then, skipping down a little in the section, we come to this paragraph:

To raise and support armies, but no appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer term than 2 years.

That provision did not find its way into the Constitution without a great deal of debate and discussion, and, as a matter of fact, somewhat similar propositions had been incorporated in the constitutions of several of the original

States. They are referred to in the debates and also in the article in the *Federalist*, written by Alexander Hamilton, bearing upon this particular part of the Constitution.

As a predicate for what I expect to ask of the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, I should like to read a portion of two paragraphs from Mr. Hamilton's paper, as printed in the *Federalist*. He has previously discussed the provisions in State constitutions, and the fact that they were not highly effective, and he then continues:

Let us examine whether there be any comparison, in point of efficacy, between the provision alluded to, and that which is contained in the new constitution for restraining the appropriations of money for military purposes to the period of 2 years. The former—

He means, of course, the provisions contained in the State constitutions—by aiming at too much, is calculated to effect nothing: the latter, by steering clear of an imprudent extreme, and by being perfectly compatible with a proper provision for the exigencies of the Nation, will have a salutary and powerful operation.

The Legislature of the United States will be obliged, by this provision, once at least in every 2 years, to deliberate upon the propriety of keeping a military force on foot; to come to a new resolution on the point; and to declare their sense of the matter, by a formal vote in the face of their constituents. They are not at liberty to vest in the executive department permanent funds for the support of an army, if they were even incautious enough to be willing to repose in it so improper a confidence.

There is more in the paper by Mr. Hamilton which bears upon this subject, but I think I have quoted the most important portions of the paper.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Referring, for instance, to page 19, line 17, do I correctly understand that the Senator is objecting to the words "and thereafter, for the purposes authorized in this paragraph"? The whole sentence would read:

For expenditures during fiscal year 1952 and thereafter, and \$80,000,000 for expenditures during fiscal 1953.

If a semicolon is placed after the numeral "1953" and the words eliminated "and thereafter, for the purposes authorized in this paragraph", does the Senator believe that would be constitutional?

Mr. HOLLAND. I believe so, however, I think—

Mr. FERGUSON. If the Senator will yield further, the Senator from Michigan had intended to raise the same question. I agree that this appears to be an appropriation for a longer period of time than 2 years, and, therefore, to be unconstitutional.

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate the comment of the distinguished Senator. In order that the point may be fully made, however, for the record—because I apprehend that this exchange may have more than a temporary meaning—I should like to continue my point. I

find that in the years which are in the past, this question has come up several times, and there have been two opinions rendered by former Attorneys General of the United States. I have read both of those opinions. I shall not discuss them at length at this time, unless there be Members of the Senate who are desirous of my doing so.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President—

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida has raised a most interesting question, and I should be interested in knowing, on the basis of the Senator's study of the opinions of the Attorneys General and his reading of the *Federalist* papers, whether any technical distinction was made in the minds of the founding fathers between the Army and the Navy. Of course, the language of the Constitution refers only to the Army.

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes, such a distinction was made. The Senator may refer also to a matter which has been the basis for distinction in the two opinions rendered by two former Attorneys General of the United States. In both of those opinions a distinction has been made which I think is artificial, to say the least, between those appropriations which are made for the salary of military personnel and for their clothing and subsistence, which those opinions say are covered by the provision of the Constitution, and the appropriation for the manufacture of guns or military supplies or the supplying of ordnance or of ammunition, or of all the things, in short, which make an army a military force. Without the existence of those military things, of course, a group of persons banded together as an army would be nothing more than a group of persons; and the position of the Attorneys General to the effect that there is a difference between those two classes of expenditure is, I think, most artificial.

However, I may say to the distinguished Senator that the inadequacy of the opinions of the Attorneys General goes even further than would be indicated by that unrealistic distinction, because the principal case in which the matter arose was not a question of the propriety of making an appropriation for more than 2 years; it was a question of whether an authorization of an expenditure which it would take more than 2 years to carry out—the authorization, for instance, of a contract to build a ship which it would take more than 2 years to build—would be legal. That, as the Senator will realize, is a completely different question from the question of outright appropriations in money, because an authorization of a contract for the expenditure of funds is something which can be stopped at any time by the Congress, in its judgment, and which will at most call for simply the payment of a penalty or of damages of some kind or other; but it would still leave it to the discretion of the Congress as to whether a contract authorized and under way should be continued to its completion or should be halted in the stage in which

it was found at the time. The Senator will recall that not only the Congress has this right of stopping contracts, but also the executive department itself. In a recent instance, the late Secretary of Defense, Mr. Johnson, stopped the construction of a very large carrier which was being constructed at Newport News, when the work had not gone far, requiring, of course, the payment of large sums of liquidated damages, or of determined damages, but not permitting the completion of the contract. It is an illustration of the fact that contractual authorization goes far short of the actual appropriation of money. So I want to say for the RECORD that it seems to me that the decision of the Attorney General in the original case, which was simply referred to and affirmed in the second case, goes far short of meeting the question presented in this bill, because it had to do with contractual authorization rather than with actual appropriations over a period of more than 2 years.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield further to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. I thank the Senator from Florida. I agree with him that the issue which is presented by this question insofar as it involves the appropriation of cash instead of the use of contract authority, and making it available for more than two fiscal years, certainly raises a different question from any we have had presented in prior instances.

Historically, I believe that the position taken by the Attorney General, to which allusion has been made, is the rule which has been followed. For instance, I recall raising the question in connection with appropriations in the House, where I was told that there is a difference between appropriations for pay and appropriations for procurement; that appropriation for pay of the Army and appropriations for subsistence, and appropriations for clothing and equipage, were probably covered by the constitutional limitation, but that appropriations for ordnance or appropriations for construction were not. I think the House has historically proceeded upon that basis.

However, we have another interesting angle here, which is that the Air Force originally was the Army Air Corps, at the time that the Air Force was a part of the Army. In the sense of being the Army Air Corps, it was understood that the appropriations for air were under the same limitations as the appropriations for the Army. Now, however, with a Department of the Air Force, a Department of the Navy, and a Department of the Army, so far as I can see, the situation which the Navy has heretofore enjoyed is now being cared for by the Air Force, in the very limited fields of pay, subsistence, clothing, and equipage.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I appreciate the comments of the distinguished Senator. I noted in some of the hearing records and some of the reports that he had raised this specific question when he was a distinguished Member of the House, and I noted that the point

was made, pursuant to his question, that there was this difference between procurement and pay, subsistence, clothing, and the like, to which he has referred. However, the practice has not gone so far, at all, as to depart from the constitutional method of handling it, by reason of this fact. There seems to have been a very careful survey of each appropriation bill, at least in the recent past—I have gone over the last two very carefully, and I am told by the staff that it has been going on for some time—to see what unexpended balances there were at the end of each 2-year period, and then to have those unexpended balances reappropriated in the current bill so as to carry them forward and bring them outside the prohibition of the Constitution. I believe the Senator will find that that practice has prevailed very meticulously, insofar as the Senator from Florida has been able to go into the question in the little time he has had available.

Mr. CASE. I think the Senator's observation is well founded. I think it has had the salutary effect, which was sought by the founders of the Constitution, of assuring that vast sums of unobligated balances were not continued indefinitely and applied, perhaps, to purposes far different from those originally in mind when the appropriation was first made.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator. I want to say that the Senator from Wyoming, in his able work as chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the armed services, has meticulously observed the matter of carrying forward balances, not only in the bill but in the report. The distinguished Senator has very carefully brought it to the attention of the Congress that there are very large unexpended balances, amounting, I believe, to some \$44,000,000,000—

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Amounting to \$39,000,000,000.

Mr. HOLLAND. He calls attention to that fact, and, so far as the Senator from Wyoming is concerned, he has been meticulous in his adherence to that precedent which apparently has been maintained consciously by the Senator and his committee, as well as by preceding committees in this field. I commend him and them for doing that. There is certainly no thought on the part of the Senator from Florida of suggesting that there are any hidden items here, nor is there any thought that anyone is trying to evade the Constitution. The only thought that the Senator from Florida has in connection with the matter is that if this new formula were used such use would be of highly questionable constitutionality and could easily be made the basis for later procedure entirely different from that which has been followed heretofore, and for that reason he feels it should not be used even this once. It may well become mischievous on some occasions.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am grateful to the Senator from Florida for his generous remarks with reference to the chairman of the subcommittee. I desire to point out, however, that in addition to what the Senator has said about the de-

sirability of making certain that excessive appropriations are not to be built up, the Committee on Appropriations, at the suggestion of the chairman of the subcommittee, has authorized me to address a letter to the Department of Defense requesting a complete report upon all outstanding contract authority so that we may know what contract authority has been liquidated and thereby used, and what contract authority has not been used.

With respect to the 12 items to which the Senator has alluded, let me say that they deal in every instance with procurement of long-life items, the sort of items which the Attorney General of the United States, Mr. Hoyt, in 1904, had in mind when the distinguished and able constitutional lawyer, Philander C. Knox, was Secretary of War, and when the opinion of the Attorney General was rendered to the effect that long-life items did not explicitly come within the meaning of the constitutional provision. I think that perhaps there may have been a little rationalization in that opinion. We are now, however, making available such huge sums of money that greater care than ever is necessary to be exercised.

I feel that the bill should go from the Chamber in such form that it will be perfectly clear that we want to stay within the Constitution. I am hoping that if divine providence can stay the drift of the world into a third world war, in another year or two it may be possible to rescind some of these appropriations.

I wish to point out that the contracts which are let for the various procurement items contain provisions for the termination of the contracts when the procurement items are no longer needed. So that I feel that the amendment which the Senator from Florida and I have discussed, and which was just mentioned by the Senator from Michigan, to delete the words "and thereafter", after the figure "1953", should be adopted in each of these cases.

When the Senator from Florida has completed his statement, if he desires to make a motion to that effect, I shall be very happy indeed to accept it.

Mr. HOLLAND. I warmly thank the Senator.

In the first place, I may say that it seems to me that certain questions and answers in the RECORD might make it very clear that the intent is to stay strictly within the constitutional provision. Therefore, may I ask this question of the distinguished Senator from Wyoming: Notwithstanding the wording of the report and the wording of the bill, was it the intention of the subcommittee which he heads that the whole of the appropriation made as a 1952 fiscal-year appropriation was for commitment and obligation in fiscal 1952?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; but it was recognized that because of the length of time necessary to build and construct certain of the items, a certain portion of the funds could not possibly be expended during the fiscal year 1952, particularly since we are now in the third month of that year.

Mr. HOLLAND. As a second question, may I ask the Senator this: Is it not correct that the desire of the Senator to break down the expenditures into two groups, one, of some \$37,000,000,000-plus, to be expended in fiscal year 1952, and a second, of some \$23,000,000,000-plus, to be expended in 1953, was primarily for the purpose of advising the country clearly that the appropriation, huge as it was, could not possibly be expended in 1 year and could not possibly bring about the economic difficulties which would be created by the expenditure of such a huge sum in this field in 1 year, but, instead, would be divided between the 2 years substantially in the amounts which I have stated and which are stated in the report as well as in the bill?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Not only that, but also that the annual revenues of the Government for the fiscal year 1952 would not be called upon to bear the burdens of expenditures which cannot be made until 1953. So, while we are making an appropriation for expenditures in 2 years, we also have revenues which will accumulate in the Treasury during the same 2 years; and the burden of this huge appropriation bill is not all cast upon the revenues of 1952.

Mr. HOLLAND. I may say that I thoroughly approve the logic behind both reasons for the stating of these two amounts, and I gladly join as to the desirability of that method of approach.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. I am glad to hear it stated that it is proposed to offer an amendment to strike out the words "and thereafter," for I point out that that solves a very great difficulty the conferees would have. Under the rule of the House of Representatives the words "and thereafter" would constitute legislation, and would not be in order on an appropriation bill. Under the rule of the House the words "and thereafter" would be regarded as being beyond the jurisdiction of the appropriate committees of the Congress to report. Consequently it would constitute legislation which the conferees would have to secure acceptance of by the House. Under the technical rule of the House, insertion of the words "and thereafter" would make it necessary that each one of these amendments be taken back to the House for a separate vote, and it would not be possible to obtain any agreement in conference were the technical point to be raised.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from South Dakota for that excellent contribution.

My third question to be addressed to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming is this. Having in mind that some of the expenditure covered by this appropriation might not even be completed at the end of the second year, would it not meet the purpose which the Senator has in mind just as well to delete the words "and thereafter", looking forward to the renewal or continuance of any unexpended balance in the appropria-

tion bill for the year 1954 at the proper time to take the place of those words and the implications gained from them now?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If I understand the Senator's question clearly—my attention was diverted for a moment—I think the elimination of the words "and thereafter" after "1953" would accomplish what we all have in mind.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to restate the question, since the Senator's attention was drawn elsewhere. My question was whether the purposes which he has in mind would be well safeguarded and could be thoroughly carried out even though the words "and thereafter," which are the objectionable words here, were eliminated, by pursuing the practice which has heretofore prevailed, and which I believe has prevailed up to this year in the Congress, of reappropriating unexpended balances, if any there be, of this appropriation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do.

Mr. HOLLAND. In the drafting of the annual appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1954?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It would be my thought that the legislative record which we are making here now should be that any unexpended balances at the end of fiscal 1953 would have to be reappropriated by the Congress. I feel that that would be a very excellent precedent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me on that point?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I do not desire to prolong this discussion, because I entirely agree with the Senator from Wyoming in accepting the amendment. But for the RECORD I should like to point out—I think I am right, but I am not certain—that in, we will say, this appropriation for 1953, if the money is obligated by June 30 of 1953, it can be carried over and expended in 1954 and 1955. In other words, any appropriation obligated before the end of any fiscal year can be held good for 2 years thereafter.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I would want to make the record clear that by this discussion it is the intention of the Senate, in accepting this amendment, that there should be action on a future appropriation bill to make such unexpended balances available for expenditure.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I think I am in accord with both of the Senators in general, but I do call attention to the fact, and I ask that the Senator from Massachusetts follow this item, that while a portion of this appropriation is to be expended under the terms of the bill in fiscal 1953, this is, as a whole, an appropriation for fiscal 1952, and it so becomes under the terms of section 1 of the bill. As the Senator from Wyoming has already stated, which I understand is a fact, this whole amount, whether to be expended this year or next, is a subject to be committed, and is intended to be committed in this fiscal year 1952, and that, therefore, for that one good reason, the law which

applies to customary appropriations might not necessarily apply to that portion of the expenditures to be made in next year, 1953.

Further, I should like to say that while there is a general statute permitting expenditure during the next 2 years of sums committed—at least as the Senator from Florida understands it—out of the appropriation for a given fiscal year, there is no assurance whatsoever that that provision would apply in the case of military appropriations if the point should be made, because the provision of the Constitution rather bluntly would apply to the case and would prevent the use in the second of those two additional years if such an interpretation were followed. So I strongly hope that the position taken by the Senator from Wyoming will be accepted, and that the practice which has prevailed heretofore will continue, of renewing and reenacting unexpended portions of appropriations before the time runs on them, before the two constitutional years of time runs on them, so that no question may arise in this field.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I agree entirely with the Senator from Florida that the more supervision the Congress keeps over the funds, the better. If we reappropriate unexpended funds, it means we have got to look them over, and that is a good thing to do.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts for his observation.

The purpose of the Senator from Florida in rising and calling attention to the constitutional provision is very clear. It is to require the Congress itself to assume responsibility of renewing appropriations which are unexpended. By the recurring debate of the matter here upon the floor, people throughout the land will be advised that there may not be continuing appropriations, and that no funds will remain available beyond 2 years after the date of an appropriation in this field of military expenditures. Under the thinking of the framers of the Constitution, which I fully share, the soundest way to keep our country one in which the civilian agencies of Government will always control the military is by refusing to turn over the money keys for too long a period of time.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. GREEN. Do I understand the Senator's amendment is in line 17, to strike out the words "and thereafter"?

Mr. HOLLAND. We have not gotten to the actual amendments, and there may be some difficulties in connection with that, because I believe all these amendments—there are 12 of them—are to committee amendments which have been adopted, and which may have to be reconsidered in order that amendments to them may be taken up.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No; there is an understanding—it was entered into last night—that all these items could be reviewed today. The purpose, of course,

being to enable the Senator to bring up his very valuable discussion.

If the Senator from Rhode Island will look at page 24 of the bill, he will find one of the items. In line 16, after the figures "1953" the proposal would be to strike out the words "and thereafter."

Mr. GREEN. Should it not be done in both places?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No; not in both places, I think.

Mr. GREEN. Why not?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Because I think the legislative history we are making here is quite clear, that that is merely intended to allow the expenditure of balances of that fund during 1953.

Mr. GREEN. In one place it says "1952 and thereafter", and in another place it says "1953 and thereafter."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I would amend the amendment of the Senator from Florida by inserting after the word "thereafter" where that word follows the figures 52, the words "in 1953."

Mr. GREEN. That is my point.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That would overcome the objection which the Senator from Rhode Island raises.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I accept the modification of my amendment in each case, but I want to call attention to one further point in connection with the very matter which the Senator from Rhode Island has brought up. I invite the attention of the Senator from Wyoming, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] to the fact that, with respect to some of these items, there may be other words which call for a legislative interpretation and understanding. I particularly refer to the words "to remain available until expended," to be found in lines 22 and 23 on page 40. There are several of the 12 instances in which that formula also appears in the appropriation. The Senator from Florida, believing that the Senator from Wyoming means those words to be interpreted in consonance with the constitutional provision, wishes to address this question to the Senator from Wyoming:

Wherever the words "to remain available until expended" are found in this military appropriation bill, is it the understanding and intent of the Senator from Wyoming that those words should call for an expenditure within the 2 years provided in the Constitution, and would not be efficacious beyond that time?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. On this point I think attention should be called to the fact that the amendment which the Senator is now reading apparently applies to the Navy and not to the Army. The constitutional provision which the Senator has read refers specifically to armies and not to navies. It was because of that distinction that the Department of Justice, on January 2, 1904, as I understand, made the distinction—no; I am wrong about that. As I glance through the opinion, I see that it had to do with the Secretary of War, and with the expenditure of a sum for contract authority, I believe.

However, the same theory was adopted in 1948, in connection with an inquiry

directed to the Attorney General by the Secretary of the Air Force. The opinion of the Attorney General at that time, dated January 8, 1948, had to do with the correctness or incorrectness of the advice of the counsel of the Department of the Air Force, that—

There appears to be no legal objection to a request to the Congress to appropriate funds to the Air Force for the procurement of aircraft and aeronautical equipment, to remain available until expended.

Of course the words "to remain available until expended" in this use, so far as the Air Force is concerned, and so far as the Navy is concerned, carry over beyond the 2-year period.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. Let me make this comment, because I think the RECORD should show it: The Senator from Wyoming is entirely correct in his statement that the constitutional provisions covering the authority to raise armies and the authority to maintain a navy are different. They are found in succeeding paragraphs in section 8 of Article I. The one which we have been discussing is paragraph 12, and the one following, paragraph 13, reads as follows:

To provide and maintain a navy.

There is no time limitation in that paragraph with respect to providing and maintaining a navy.

However, as to the Air Force, I am not at all sure that the provision applicable to the Army would not be the one applicable to it, because it was carved out of the Army, and because it is quite evident from the paper of Mr. Hamilton from which I have already quoted that he thought of the measure as affecting all military purposes, because those are the words which he uses in his discussion of the matter.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I agree with the Senator from Florida, but I think it is important in the discussion here that we should always bear in mind that the defense of the United States, in this era of tremendous scientific advance, is our paramount purpose. We want to be careful, however, that we shall not be building up huge carry-over items which could be used for improper purposes. We ought to have a system which will guarantee continuous scrutiny by Congress of these expenditures. With that philosophy I completely agree. If in the consideration of these amendments when they go to conference it may seem necessary to add some additional language to make this general purpose clear, and at the same time to protect the national security, I am sure that the Senator from Florida would desire to see that the conferees did that very thing.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator for his patience.

In closing, I simply wish to say that I am completely in accord with his position that this point need be given no consideration whatever in connection with the Navy appropriation. As to the Air Force appropriation, certainly it would be the part of wisdom to regard it just as carefully as we do the Army appropriation, because it was created out of the Army. For a long time it received

its appropriation as a part of the Army appropriations.

At this time, with the consent of the Senator from Wyoming, I should like to ask that the 12 amendments be considered en bloc, and adopted.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. With the exception of the Navy amendments? Did the Senator mean to indicate that? Some of these items represent procurement for the Navy. For example, there is an aircraft carrier, which cannot possibly be built within the time mentioned.

Mr. HOLLAND. I make my modified amendments apply, then, to 10 instead of 12 committee amendments, or to apply to whatever the proper number is after eliminating from consideration in this connection the appropriations for the Navy.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have made it clear to the Senator that in the conference we shall go carefully into the whole subject.

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate the candor of the Senator. I am sure that the matter will be in good hands when he handles it in conference.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming accept the amendments offered by the Senator from Florida?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I accept the amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the modified amendments to the committee amendments are agreed to en bloc.

The amendments to committee amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 6, line 8, after the word "thereafter", insert "during 1953"; and in lines 9 and 10, strike out the words "and thereafter."

On page 19, line 16, after the word "thereafter", insert "during 1953"; and in line 17, strike out the words "and thereafter."

On page 22, line 1, after the word "thereafter", insert "during 1953"; and in line 2, strike out the words "and thereafter."

On page 24, line 15, after the word "thereafter", insert "during 1953"; and in line 16, strike out the words "and thereafter."

On page 25, line 20, after the word "thereafter", insert "during 1953"; and in lines 21 and 22, strike out the words "and thereafter."

On page 27, after the word "thereafter", insert "during 1953"; and in lines 2 and 3, strike out the words "and thereafter."

On page 28, line 4, after the word "thereafter", insert "during 1953"; and in lines 5 and 6, strike out the words "and thereafter."

On page 47, line 10, after the word "thereafter", insert "during 1953"; and in line 11, strike out the words "and thereafter."

On page 48, line 1, after the word "thereafter", insert "during 1953"; and in lines 2 and 3, strike out the words "and thereafter."

On page 52, line 13, after the word "thereafter", insert "during 1953"; and in line 14, strike out the words "and thereafter."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the committee amendments, as amended, are agreed to en bloc.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. ALBERT C. VAUGHN, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

The message also communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. FRANK FELLOWS, late a Representative from the State of Maine, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5054) making appropriations for the National Security Council, the National Security Resources Board, and for military functions administered by the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I think we have now completed the committee amendments, with the exception of the amendment on page 71, beginning in line 7. I believe the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] has an amendment which he wishes to offer.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I offer an amendment on behalf of myself and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as acting minority leader I respectfully call the attention of the Senator from Wyoming to the fact that the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] also wishes to offer an amendment to line 9 of that paragraph.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. On what page?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Page 71, line 9. I shall send for the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia on behalf of himself and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 71, after the word "employees", in line 9, it is proposed to insert "(including (a) the full-time equivalent of part-time employment, (b) persons who are described as 'consultants' or who are compensated on a 'when actually employed' basis if such persons are employed on a contract basis or are paid on a per diem basis, and (c) persons employed without compensation if they are reimbursed for expenses)."

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the committee amendment in section 632 establishes a ceiling of 530,000 full-time graded civilian employees.

The committee amendment is wide open with respect to "part-time equivalents of full-time employees," persons employed as "consultants" on a contract basis, persons employed on a per diem

basis when actually working, and persons described as employed "without compensation," but who are paid lavishly for their expenses.

This amendment merely provides that for ceiling purposes these persons should be counted within the 530,000 ceiling.

It should be noted that as in the case of the committee amendment this amendment applies only to graded civilian employees, and does not affect wage board employees, such as those engaged in construction and other industrial work with such defense establishments as navy yards, arsenals, and so forth.

Like the committee, it makes no reference to "temporary employees" who may be required to meet emergencies.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I shall be very glad to accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] for himself and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] to the committee amendment is agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, have we completed action on section 632, on page 71?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Action has not been completed on it. The committee amendment is open to further amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I offer an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 71, between lines 10 and 11, it is proposed to insert a new section, as follows:

Sec. 633. No part of any appropriation made by this act for any purpose shall be used for the payment of the compensation of graded employees in excess of an amount equal to 90 percent of the amount requested for the compensation of such employees in budget estimates heretofore submitted to the Congress for the fiscal year 1952; and the total amount of each appropriation, any part of which is available for payment of the compensation of such employees, is hereby reduced by an amount equal to 10 percent of the amount requested in such budget estimates for such purposes. Nothing in this section shall be construed as reducing any amount available for payment of the compensation of such employees below an amount equal to 90 percent of the amount requested in such budget estimates for such purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would inform the Senator from Illinois that his Senator's amendment proposes to insert a new section, and does not pertain to section 632.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is apparent. Therefore the amendment on page 71, as amended, can now be adopted without at all interfering with the present consideration of the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 71, line 9, as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Illinois whether his amendment has been printed?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No; it has not been printed.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Will the Senator be good enough to explain his amendment?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes, and I shall not labor the matter for any length of time. By the committee amendment, a ceiling of 530,000 is fixed for graded positions. As amended by the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], it would include consultants, and part-time positions.

The amendment which I have offered would place a limit of 90 percent on the estimated positions. As I understand, the budget figures, when first submitted, showed that there would be an estimated number of 545,000 graded civilian positions in the Military Establishment. Of course, as of June 30, 1951, they had not reached that total.

I believe the budget figures indicate that they had 439,991 positions as of that date. In other words, they had roughly 105,000 positions to go to reach the budget estimate of June 30, 1952. If we cut down the estimated number in the budget 10 percent, it would take off roughly 54,600, and give a ceiling of 491,000 positions. It would be an increase of 51,000 over the figure that obtained on June 30, and it would be a decrease of roughly 56,000 positions.

I am not unmindful of the fact that one can argue well on both sides of the question. In the first place, we have an expanding military program. I suppose it is fair to assume that extra positions will be added. On the other hand, in going around the country and making observations in one place and another, I concur in the observation made earlier in the spring on a number of military policy bills, that there is still a substantial waste of civilian manpower.

I know of no way of dealing with it except to shrink the ceiling. The amendment would cut it by 10 percent, so that the ceiling would be about 491,000, instead of 530,000, as carried in the bill. That is the whole story of the amendment in a nutshell.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I would agree completely with what the Senator from Illinois says if it were not for one overriding fact, and that is that the committee has inserted in the bill, and the Senate has already adopted, a provision which was not budgeted, to expand the air power of the United States. We have put in the national emergency fund, which has had the approval of the Senate, a provision to procure additional aircraft and additional air personnel, so that the United States of America and all of its people may know—and that, more important than that, that the Soviet dictators and their satellites may know—that the United States of America is building an air power that will be capable of delivering, in case of necessity, to the very heart of Communist aggression the weapons which research and development are making available to us.

It was for that reason that the committee in reviewing this matter, instead of adopting a ceiling of 500,000, which was proposed by the Senator from Mich-

igan [Mr. FERGUSON], adopted a ceiling of 530,000.

I readily give the assurance to the Senator from Illinois that it will be the purpose of the Appropriations Committee carefully to police all of these positions. The committee intends to proceed with that work. The additional personnel allowed by the amendment just adopted was for the purpose of enabling air power to be expanded.

Therefore, in those circumstances it is obvious, when the Senator offers an amendment which says that the ceiling shall be 90 percent of what the Budget Bureau estimated, inasmuch as the Budget Bureau never estimated anything for the additional appropriation which we have made for air power, we would by that very act impede the capacity of the Navy and the Air Force to expand as Congress wants them to expand.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am quite in agreement with the argument, and I am certainly in full concurrence with the necessity of serving notice on Marshal Stalin that we mean business and that we intend to build up the air power of this country. I am equally interested in serving notice to him that this is going to be an efficient operation.

I regret to say that I entertain some doubts. I believe the weakness of the committee's position and the weakness of the position of the Bureau of the Budget, with which I have had a good many dealings over a long period of years, is simply this: I could never find that they had had adequate staffing to go into the field and there make a survey and adequate exploration as to what the needs were. Normally their explorations and surveys consist of having departmental budget officers lay the case before them. They cut a little here, cut a little there, augment a little here, and finally come up with the ultimate figure.

The other point is that the Senate Appropriations Committee and the House Appropriations Committee are not staffed for constant surveillance of the agencies of government in Washington and in the field, to ascertain what an adequate personnel complement really is. I think a large element of guesswork is involved.

The only way I can come to a conclusion regarding the matter is to keep my eyes open and to observe as I go from one place in the country to another. As I do so, I see a considerable waste of manpower in many places where the Government has headquarters establishments and military establishments of one kind or another. I am firmly of the opinion that there is overstaffing, and that a 90-percent directive would make it possible to carry on the expanded program in the building up of our air power. That is the reason for the amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Illinois that no one desires more than do the members of the committee which reported this bill to see that overstaffing is cut down, and no one desires more than does the chairman of the subcommittee to eliminate waste and extravagance and overstaffing in every branch of the military service. I have no doubt that there are

such cases; but, as I have said before, and as I announced at the meeting of the full committee, it will be our purpose as a committee to summon the responsible officials of each of the military departments before us and make them go into this matter in detail.

We have already been doing that. For instance, I now hold in my hand a letter which I received from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Anna M. Rosenberg. I read a portion of the letter:

I am enclosing a copy of a Department of Defense directive, which I know will be of interest to you. This directive is in line with our increased activities for more effective utilization of military and civilian personnel, and incorporates the following major features:

1. Establishes a ceiling for all military and civilian personnel in departmental activities in the Washington area at the strengths actually on board on July 20, 1951. Included are the departmental activities of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force, as well as those in the various boards and activities supporting the Secretary of Defense.

2. Within the next 90 days, each military department and the agencies of the Office of the Secretary of Defense must achieve a 5-percent reduction in both military and civilian strengths within the departmental activities referred to above. These reductions will be accomplished through normal attrition or turnover, insofar as practicable, rather than through arbitrary reductions in force.

3. Military personnel will not be used to replace civilian personnel, nor shall we permit the intent of this directive to be circumvented by the expanded use of temporary duty, detail of individuals from field activities (either within or outside of the Washington area), or by any similar actions.

Mr. President, I shall not read the entire letter, but I now ask unanimous consent to have the entire letter printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C., July 26, 1951.
Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: I am enclosing a copy of a Department of Defense directive which I know will be of interest to you. This directive is in line with our increased activities for more effective utilization of military and civilian personnel, and incorporates the following major features:

1. Establishes a ceiling for all military and civilian personnel in departmental activities in the Washington area at the strengths actually on board on July 20, 1951. Included are the departmental activities of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force, as well as those in the various boards and activities supporting the Secretary of Defense.

2. Within the next 90 days, each military department and the agencies of the Office of the Secretary of Defense must achieve a 5-percent reduction in both military and civilian strengths within the departmental activities referred to above. These reductions will be accomplished through normal attrition or turn-over, insofar as practicable, rather than through arbitrary reductions in force.

3. Military personnel will not be used to replace civilian personnel, nor shall we permit the intent of this directive to be circumvented by the expanded use of temporary duty, detail of individuals from field activities (either within or outside of the Washington area), or by any similar actions.

In order to insure that any civilian personnel reductions be implemented in an

honest and efficient manner, I should like to point out that the Secretaries of the military departments have been specifically charged with the responsibility of surveying their activities and effecting this reduction by selected activity, rather than across the board, and in a manner calculated to cause the minimum interference with essential activities. I have personally discussed this aspect with the Secretaries and the Chiefs of Staff, and emphasized the necessity for making this cut in those activities where cuts would be least disruptive.

I wish to point out that the above step is, in my judgment, only the most recent evidence of the Department's sincere desire and continuing efforts to effect economy in the use of personnel. The savings in our end fiscal year 1951 civilian employment brought about by the establishment of manpower ceilings within the budgetary ceilings are an example of these efforts.

Striking evidence is also available respecting economy in the use of military personnel. Through improved utilization, the Army expects to obtain two or three more divisions than were originally planned without increasing its requested end fiscal year 1952 strength of 1,552,000.

I believe that these savings illustrate the Department's adherence to the principle that budgetary ceilings should not be thought of as floors, and that they should be treated as a limit, not a goal.

We will continue to exert every effort to achieve maximum economy in the use of all Defense Department personnel, and we will appreciate your continuing interest and cooperation toward that end.

Sincerely yours,

ANNA M. ROSENBERG.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I submit that this letter, which has come to me over the signature of the Assistant Secretary of Defense, and which was printed in the record of our committee, and was sustained by the interrogations which we directed to the author of the letter and by the interrogations which were submitted to all of the responsible officials of the Department of Defense, is sufficient to indicate an eminently good-faith attempt by the Department of Defense to avoid all unnecessary use of manpower, either civilian or military.

My deep feeling upon the matter is that the imposition of an inflexible 10-percent cut at a time while we are expanding the military effort would be wholly unwise.

I hope I am sufficiently persuasive to induce the eminent, able, and distinguished Senator from Illinois to withdraw his amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, at this time, let me make several observations which I think are directly responsive to the statement made by the able Senator from Wyoming.

In the first place, the Senator from Wyoming has read from a letter which comes from the very agency of Government which is going to spend the money. Frankly, I do not accept those figures without some little doubt, unless they can be verified in a wholly impartial fashion.

In the second place, it does not appear that the Senate Appropriations Committee has an adequate staff or a field staff which can adequately handle this matter; and the only things the committee presents to us are the result of cross-examinations in the committee. Over the years I have observed that such ex-

aminations are much like attempts in the course of a law suit to obtain information from witnesses, in that one obtains only the amount of information which the witnesses are willing to divulge.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. But in the letter to which I have referred a specific 5-percent cut is directed, and it is being carried out.

Mr. DIRKSEN. In my judgment, it is not adequate.

First, Mr. President, the spenders come before our committee and submit their figures. However, I think we are entitled to take the figures with a grain of salt until they are verified.

In the second place, the proposed \$5,000,000,000 expansion of the Air Corps calls for a ceiling on expenditures only for the year 1952, and the remainder in 1953, insofar as procurement is concerned. If that be true, and I think it is borne out by the figures carried in the bill, it certainly detracts from the case made by the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. President, the House has established no ceiling. I see no reason why the Senate conferees cannot take the amendment to conference and there go into the matter with the conferees on the part of the House, and finally determine what should be done.

I renew my observation that there is no staff of ours which has gone through the personnel figures, which are just so much guesswork unless they are verified. I think that anyone who has observed in various places in the United States the various military installations of one kind or another cannot help but come to the conclusion that they are overstaffed.

Finally, Mr. President, every Member of Congress has, after all, some concern for those who are in uniform, men of good will, men of ability, men of integrity, who are interested in the solvency of the country and who constantly emphasize and bear down on the fact that there is a waste of civilian manpower in the military establishment at the present time.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to make a comment at this point?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. One of the things of which I am most proud in connection with the presentation of this bill is the fact that the amendments adopted by the committee represent, with one or two rare exceptions, the unanimous decision of the committee. As chairman of the subcommittee, my desire throughout the consideration of this bill, as has been amply testified to here by members of the subcommittee, was to obtain a consensus of the opinion of the members of the committee and to submit to the Senate a report which represented so far as possible the unanimous view of the committee. There never was a time when we acted at all according to party lines; there was no partisan division at all. We were concerned with only one thing, namely, to report a bill which would enable the Department of Defense to provide effectively and efficiently for the defense of our country.

I wish to say to the Senator from Illinois—and I beg him to believe what

I say—that the Under Secretary of Defense, who now has been nominated to take the place of General Marshall, Mr. Robert Lovett, throughout the consideration of the budget left no stone unturned to eliminate unnecessary appropriations.

Mr. Wilfred J. McNeil, the various departmental secretaries, the entire staff of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, and members of the departmental staff, were all cooperating with the committee in its effort to reduce appropriations. If the Senator has observed what has been said here, he will know that, even when the Department asked for restorations, the committee never went along with the full amount of restoration requested, except, perhaps, in one instance which comes to my mind. There has been a studious and intensive effort to keep personnel down, and to save dollars. The committee is not dropping the matter now, but will proceed.

I am not at all sure, I may say to the Senator, that a large additional staff would be helpful and efficient. I think that the most effective thing we can do is to bring the responsible officials before a committee of the Congress and make sure that they leave the committee room knowing that we expect them to take action along the line desired by the committee.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, anyone who is familiar with the armed services of this country knows that one way for a ranking officer to get a promotion for himself is to take on more and more personnel, so that he can establish to the satisfaction of his superiors that he is discharging a greater responsibility. That is what is happening, and it has been for some time. They hand in their figures, and those are the figures which are finally compounded in the form of the military, naval, and air estimates which are submitted to the committees on appropriations. I know what the formula is. I have heard it and I have been confronted with it a thousand times. The question begins, "How many graded positions do you have? What was the budget estimate? How many do you need? What do you want them for? How are they disposed, and how are they assigned?" Senators take the word of the people who make the requests, who ask for the money, and who ask for the positions.

Over the years, it has been my duty and my responsibility to help cut down the Federal payroll, and it could be done only in proportion as we sent representatives into the departments to develop some familiarity with the operation and find out where the waste and extravagance and overstaffing in manpower really existed.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, a moment ago he remarked that he knew from experience how the committees handled the requests of departments, and he said, "Senators take the word of the agency which is going to expend the money." I assure the Senator that that statement does not apply to the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, because we did not take the word of those who were to spend the money, and did not take

the estimates which they made with respect to graded employees' restorations. On numerous occasions we gave only part of what was requested, and in some cases we allowed none of the increases. We made it clear to all three of the departments of defense that it was our purpose to cut this budget to the limit, and also that we were not going to wrap up the book and put it on the shelf the minute this appropriation bill was passed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the answer to that is simply this: If they ask for 50 percent more than they need, and the committee gives them 25 percent under their request, they still receive 25 percent more than their requirements.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. But let me say that the doors of the committee were open, and Senators who wished to offer amendments or to interrogate any witness, or to bring forward witnesses, were welcome to do so. I asked every personnel officer who appeared before the committee whether his job or his salary was dependent upon the number of people under his employ. I went into that whole feature.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me ask the Senator, is it not true that the senior Senator from Michigan actually made a proposal in the committee to set a ceiling of 500,000?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I just said so; and I explained to the Senator that the reason why we did not do it was because of the 7,400 restorations we made, and because of the conviction of the committee that the expansion of air power would make it impracticable.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am not wedded to any approach in the matter, Mr. President. I can modify the amendment so as to make it 491,000, which would have the effect of a 10-percent cut; or I would even be generous in the matter and make it 500,000, if that would satisfy the Senator from Wyoming; or I would leave it on a 10-percent basis. But I must persist, Mr. President, in the viewpoint I express, because it is a matter of deep conviction with the junior Senator from Illinois.

Mr. FERGUSON rose.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I know the Senator from Illinois is very sincere in his views on this subject. I was about to ask the Senator from Michigan what his view would be about the matter.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan would like to have the Senator from Wyoming accept the figure of 500,000, and take the amendment to conference.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator from Illinois will modify his amendment so as to make the figure 500,000, I shall then be very happy, upon the advice of the senior Senator from Michigan, to accept the amendment and to have it studied.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the pending amendment, and to submit a new amendment, on page 71, line 9, to strike out the figures "530,000" and to insert "500,000."

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Wyoming whether

he will accept that amendment and take it to conference.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Under the great persuasive capacity of the Senator from Michigan, I yield much against my judgment.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan had proposed, on all the other bills, a 10-percent cut. He figured we were getting nearly the 10-percent cut in the 530,000. But it would be within the realm of the 10-percent cut to make it 500,000; and I ask that that be done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate has already approved section 632, but, without objection, the Senate will reconsider the vote by which section 632 was agreed to, and change the figure in the amendment, as amended, to 500,000.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Chair stated that, without objection, the Senate would reconsider the vote by which section 632 was agreed to. I merely wanted to be very careful, having in mind future amendments. In the case of an amendment, the other day, there was no question of reconsideration. The bill was open to amendment. The question might arise again.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think the Senator from Massachusetts is under a misapprehension. This amendment was open, but it was concluded today. Therefore the statement of the Chair is the proper parliamentary statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment as amended is agreed to.

The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I call up an amendment, which I sent to the desk this morning, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of the bill is proposed to add the following new section:

SEC. —. (a) For the purpose of establishing safeguards with respect to the use of appropriated and other funds, the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation of the operation of the program for the procurement and construction of supplies, materials, munitions, vehicles, aircraft, vessels, plants, camps, and other articles and facilities in connection with the national defense, including—

(1) the types and terms of contracts awarded on behalf of the United States;

(2) the methods by which such contracts are awarded and contractors selected;

(3) the utilization of the facilities of small business concerns, through subcontracts or otherwise;

(4) the geographic distribution of contracts and location of plants and facilities;

(5) the effect of such program with respect to labor and the migration of labor;

(6) the performance of contracts and the accounting required of contractors;

(7) benefits accruing to contractors with respect to amortization for the purposes of taxation or otherwise;

(8) practices of management or labor, and prices, fees, and charges, which interfere with such program or unduly increase its cost; and

(9) such other matters as the committee deems appropriate. The committee shall report to the Senate, from time to time, the results of its study and investigation, together with its recommendations.

(b) For the purposes of this section, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to employ on a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable. The expenses of the committee under this section, which shall not exceed \$50,000 plus such additional sums as may be authorized by the Senate, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is simply that the committee may have an able staff whose duty and responsibility will be to check specifically the expenditure of funds as we proceed in the rearmament and redevelopment of our national defense. Sixty-one billion dollars is a tremendous sum of money. It will be necessary that we check the expenditure of these funds in order to assure that we are not appropriating excessively, and that we are getting a dollar's worth for every dollar expended.

For that purpose, Mr. President, this amendment will establish a watchdog committee comparable to the committee which was in existence during World War II, when there was a military expenditure and a defense program comparable with the present one. I believe the amendment is not only needed, but that it will accomplish much in obtaining economy in every division of the Federal Government.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THYE. I am most happy to yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. HAYDEN. I was compelled to ask the Senator from Minnesota to yield because I notice the reference to an expenditure from the contingent fund, which would have to be approved by the Committee on Rules and Administration. I may say to the Senator that perhaps he is not aware that what was practically the Truman committee, which was in existence during World War II, has been in existence for approximately 10 years, and is in existence today in the form of a subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services. Its chairman is the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON].

I will say to the Senator further that at the present time the Committee on Rules and Administration has made available to the subcommittee \$190,000, which will be available until January. At that time we expect to renew the appropriation. So I feel that what the Senator from Minnesota is proposing is a duplication of an existing committee which has been performing very fine work.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I had given thought to that very question and had studied it, and I found on page 23 of Public Law 601 of the Seventy-ninth

Congress, chapter 753, second session, a reference to that very committee. I read from the law:

To assist the Congress in appraising the administration of the laws and in developing such amendments or related legislation as it may deem necessary, each standing committee of the Senate and the House of Representatives shall exercise continuous watchfulness of the execution by the administrative agencies concerned of any laws, the subject matter of which is within the jurisdiction of such committee; and, for that purpose, shall study all pertinent reports and data submitted to the Congress by the agencies in the executive branch of the Government.

I am familiar with the subcommittee to which the Senator from Arizona has referred, but it was my understanding that its function had more to do with the question of preparedness, such as stockpiling, and obtaining strategic material for the armament program, and it was not my understanding that it was in the category of obtaining information as to how funds are expended in the Defense Department.

Mr. HAYDEN. If the Senator will refer to the resolution of the Committee on Armed Services authorizing the establishment of that subcommittee, he will find that it has complete authority in the field which he has outlined.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. THYE. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The language which the Senator from Minnesota read was in the law which was in effect during the Seventy-ninth and Eightieth Congresses. In the Seventy-ninth Congress, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] was the chairman of the so-called watchdog committee, and in the Eightieth Congress I was the chairman. The subcommittee which is now acting is under the chairmanship of the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON]. It was established by resolution last year, and is now acting under that resolution.

The subcommittee made a very exhaustive study of the subject of tin and another exhaustive study and report on the subject of rubber. It has made several investigations of overcrowding in camps. In one instance, I remember, it eliminated graft of a rather minor character. I think there would be duplication of work if the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota should be adopted.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. THYE. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I congratulate the Senator from Minnesota for the amendment which he has offered. There is no doubt that for any adequate scrutiny of the funds appropriated by the pending bill the manpower resources of the Senate are inadequate. We are being asked to appropriate more than \$61,000,000,000. I am informed that the staff of the Subcommittee on Military Appropriations consists of one man, who, I believe, is now present in the Senate. I believe the staff of the House commit-

tee consists of two men. Our manpower resources are not sufficient to deal with the situation. I suppose the Department of Defense employs thousands of men to prepare the budget, ably argue questions, and supply the figures when they are questioned by Members of the other body or of this body.

We must also face the fact that while the Bureau of the Budget may be valuable in bringing the requests of the armed services down to a figure which the President sets, when that budget once comes up on the Hill the Bureau of the Budget is certainly not the agency of Congress, but is the agency of the executive. The Bureau defends that budget rather than trying to find ways by which the taxpayers' burdens can be relieved. I think the Senator from Minnesota has taken a most constructive step, and I congratulate him upon the approach which he has made.

I should like to ask a question, if I may. Do I understand correctly that the committee is to be a subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, or a special committee?

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I will say to the able and distinguished Senator from Illinois that I introduced a joint resolution on this subject on May 28 of this year, but I have not been able to secure action on it. At that time by that joint resolution I endeavored to create a "watchdog committee." I cannot now see any other way to accomplish the purpose except to submit my proposal in the form of an amendment to the appropriation bill. That is why I have offered it as an amendment. I shall be most happy to have other Senators act as cosponsors of the amendment with me.

Mr. President, I have sat through all the Armed Services Subcommittee hearings I could possibly attend, listening to the budget requests by the various defense agencies and the various military agencies. I know that it is utterly impossible for me—and I question whether it is possible for anyone else—to determine whether we have squeezed out all the surplus from the budget requests. The way we can determine whether the funds will be wisely expended or not is by having a "watchdog committee," which will investigate, not only on an accounting basis, but actually examine what is done in the construction of the various installations, as well as to investigate the manpower employed in the various branches and in the various plants as well as in the Military Establishment.

Mr. MORSE, Mr. FERGUSON, and Mr. DOUGLAS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. THYE. I yield first to the Senator from Oregon, because he has been on his feet for a longer time than other Senators.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the courtesy of the Senator from Minnesota. Let me assure him, prior to my raising objections to his amendment, that I am of one mind with him for the need of the kind of investigation for which he is calling. I respectfully point out to him that I share the view of the Senator from Arizona,

that the work which the Senator from Minnesota proposes to have done has already been started by the watchdog committee of the Armed Services Committee.

In my opinion, we are dealing here with a jurisdictional problem. I think the duty in question falls within the jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee. I feel that when legislation of this character is passed, the Armed Services Committee of the Senate owes a responsibility to this body to see to it that the funds are properly spent in accordance with the legislative objectives of the Congress of the United States. I am sure the Senator from Minnesota will appreciate what I believe he will find to be the feeling and the attitude of the members of the Armed Services Committee, that we should be allowed to do our job under the able leadership of the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON]. I can assure the Senator from Minnesota that I know of no more hard-working committee than the Preparedness Committee of the Armed Services Committee, as demonstrated by the reports it has already submitted this year.

To create another committee which would be bound to overlap, and duplicate the work of the Armed Services Committee, I respectfully say would not be in the interest of the efficient operation of the Senate. I think that what the Senator from Minnesota should do is to join with the rest of us in insisting that every possible facility be made available to the Johnson subcommittee so that it can carry on the studies that need to be made.

Therefore, I respectfully point out to the Senator from Minnesota that I believe he is offering an amendment to an appropriation bill which is legislation on an appropriation bill, and I raise a point of order to that effect.

Mr. FERGUSON and Mr. DOUGLAS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield, and if so to whom?

Mr. THYE. I yield first to the Senator from Michigan, who was first on his feet.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan first wishes to say, in reply to the Senator from Oregon, that he does not see the picture at all as the Senator from Oregon sees it. It is true that the Armed Services Committee has appointed an investigative subcommittee. But the Appropriations Committee is responsible for bringing to the Senate of the United States all the facts in relation to all moneys appropriated for the Armed Services. I know of no occasion when any testimony taken by the Armed Services Committee on questions of whether or not legislation should be enacted has ever been called to the attention of the Appropriations Committee. Naturally the Armed Services Committee takes the testimony; they obtain the evidence. They are familiar with it. It is in relation to matters with which they deal. They conduct hearings on the question as to whether or not the laws ought to be changed in relation to the armed services. But the Appropriations Committee has the responsibility of recommending the appro-

priation of dollars, and it is that committee which must obtain the knowledge as to the need for spending the public money in order that they may report proper measures for the consideration of the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment, so I may reply to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. THYE. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. In the first place, let me say to the Senator from Michigan that there is ample evidence available to him as to the suggestions the Armed Services Committee have made to the Appropriations Committee time and time again through members of the Armed Services Committee who have sat as ex-officio members of various subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee. The records of the Armed Services Committee have been called to the attention of the Appropriations Committee through those representatives. This year I have served as one of the ex-officio members of the Armed Services Committee in conferences with members of the Appropriations Committee, with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], for example, who is in charge of the bill which is now before the Senate. We have made our suggestions available to the Appropriations Committee time and time again. But I remind my good friend from Michigan that after the Appropriations Committee takes the testimony that causes it to bring forth an appropriation bill, and the appropriations have been made, and the departments to whom the appropriations have been made proceed to function under the legislation enacted it is the primary obligation of the committees that have jurisdiction over those departments to see to it that the policies called for by the appropriations are carried out. That is the function of a legislative committee. It is the function, for example, of the Armed Services Committee with regard to the Defense Department. If the Defense Department follows a policy which is not sound, the Armed Services Committee ought to call it to task. We should not have a subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee functioning also as an Armed Services Committee because there will be nothing but jurisdictional strife if that is done.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I will say to the able and distinguished Senator from Oregon that as a member of the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee dealing with appropriations for the armed services, I have sat in hearings conducted with respect to sundry items contained in the appropriation bill, and as a member of that subcommittee who has sat through most of the hearings I cannot this afternoon state that we have squeezed every unnecessary and surplus item out of this appropriation bill. As a member of the Appropriations Committee I feel that we have a responsibility to Congress and to the taxpayers to examine every item appropriated for in this bill, as it is being expended by the Defense Department, to make certain that the funds are wisely expended. I believe that the Appropriations Committee is the logical committee to have that

responsibility upon it, because we must justify our recommendations for appropriations when the bill is brought before this body, and we have to justify to the Senate the various items contained in the appropriation bill. We must state that it is our opinion and our best judgment that the bill we have reported to the Senate is the best bill we can bring before this legislative body.

If we must defend it here, then I believe it is our responsibility to make certain that the funds provided throughout the biennium for which we are appropriating are wisely expended. It is for that reason that I introduced the joint resolution to begin with. It is one reason why I am trying to spike it to a bill which I know will be passed. I know that my resolution has not had consideration since last May 28, when it was introduced. That is why I am speaking in support of such a watchdog committee, to determine whether we are getting our dollar's worth out of every appropriation dollar which we now provide for the armed services and the Defense Department.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THYE. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Again I congratulate the Senator from Minnesota for what I think is the most constructive move of the past 3 days, something which is absolutely needed if we are to prevent military expenditures from absorbing the entire national vitality. He has made a contribution of the first magnitude.

Permit me to say that so far as the jurisdictional dispute which has arisen on the floor in the past few minutes is concerned, no group has done a better job than the so-called Preparedness Subcommittee, headed by the distinguished junior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON]. The work which he has done in the field of tin and rubber, and in the field of overcrowding of the induction centers, has been of the first water. We are very proud of him. I told him once personally that I thought that during this session of the Senate he had perhaps made the greatest substantive contribution of any Member of the Senate. I affirm my statement.

However, the scope of the powers of his subcommittee is so broad that I think it is very difficult for it to concentrate on the specific field of acting as a watchdog over defense spending.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, if I may interrupt the Senator from Illinois, I should like to pay my personal respects and commendation to the able and distinguished Senator from Texas for the work he is doing. However, I place him in an entirely different field from that which I am endeavoring to cover by this amendment. I place him in the military field, the field of determining whether the military is taking proper steps to make certain that it has the strategic materials to develop the defense which is necessary. I recognize that he has a responsibility to a soldier who has been inducted, to make certain that the soldier has clothing, to make certain that he has weapons with which

to fight, to make certain that he has camp facilities which will not in any sense injure his health. In that field the subcommittee and its able chairman have done a most commendable job, and I support him at every step, if he needs my support. However, I feel that that is an entirely different field from that for which I am endeavoring to create a watchdog committee. It is the duty of the subcommittee of the Senator from Texas to see that the military have the materials to do with, but it is our job to see that the appropriations which we provide are properly expended. It is our job, if the appropriations are excessive, to see that they are not squandered. If they are excessive, there should be something left when we make a reexamination of the budget and of the appropriations which we previously made.

We are here today considering a \$61,000,000,000-plus appropriation bill. If we accept this amendment, we shall be providing \$50,000 to examine into the question as to how the \$61,000,000,000 is to be expended. I think there is a need to do exactly that.

I am not endeavoring to cast the slightest reflection upon the ability of the chairman of the subcommittee of which the Senator from Texas is the chairman. I am only endeavoring to give them an additional tool with which to work. That tool is a subcommittee within the Appropriations Committee, to determine whether there are excessive or foolish expenditures in the various military installations.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THYE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In other words, the so-called Johnson committee is a good preparedness committee, but we need a special committee to watch the spending of the military authorities. Similarly, the Appropriations Committee has a broad range of subjects to cover, but is it not also true that a special committee is needed to concentrate on this one field, the \$61,000,000,000 field?

The staff of the Subcommittee on Military Appropriations has, I believe, just left and walked into the cloakroom—the one man upon whom the Senate depends to furnish it with the facts concerning the appropriations of \$61,000,000,000—one man to protect the Senate.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President—

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further observation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair). The Chair is ready to rule on the point of order.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, may I finish this observation?

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, if the Chair will permit me, I should like to yield to the senior Senator from Illinois. I may say that we have not taken up too much time in discussing the question of how to safeguard the taxpayer. I think the Chair would do well to permit a little further discussion before he rules.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is very sympathetic toward the amendment of the Senator from Minne-

sota. However, the rules apply, and the Chair must attempt to abide by the rules.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I respectfully submit that I recognize that there is a rule with which the Chair must conform, but I believe that no Senator should become impatient if we spend a little time in discussing the question before the rule is invoked.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I should like to yield to the Senator from Illinois, if the Chair will withhold his ruling.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In this instance the Chair will be extremely lenient, and allow 2 minutes further discussion.

Mr. THYE. I thank the Chair.

Mr. DOUGLAS. When the Military Establishment wishes to take an objective, what it does to set up a task force. That task force will normally have naval components, military components, aviation components, and sometimes marine components. Those are harmonized into an integrated force.

We now have before us the greatest task which the Senate has ever faced. This time there is an appropriation of \$61,000,000,000, and there will be countless billions ahead in the future. Is it not appropriate that we should set up a task force to deal with this appropriation? I am wondering if perhaps we should not have a special committee, consisting of some members of the Appropriations Committee, some members of the Armed Services Committee, and possibly some members drawn from the body of the Senate, to integrate the work of the committees, but with the special task—I will not say of riding herd, but of watching with a solicitous eye the expenditures of the military to see whether they are wasteful or proper, and to make recommendations for future appropriations.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President—

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I should like to yield to the Senator from New York, who has been on his feet.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. So far the Chair is convinced that the debate is on the merits of the amendment, and not on the point of order. Therefore, the question of jurisdiction has no relationship to the point of order of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. The amendment is in violation of paragraph 4 of rule XVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, and in the opinion of the Chair is not in order.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair therefore sustains the point of order.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I should like to speak on the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. FERGUSON. Before the Chair rules on the point of order, I should like to call attention to the fact that this may not be legislation. I read from pages 159 and 160 of the rules of the Senate:

Each standing committee of the Senate and the House of Representatives (other than the Appropriations Committees) is au-

thorized to appoint by a majority vote of the committee not more than four professional staff members in addition to the clerical staffs on a permanent basis without regard to political affiliations and solely on the basis of fitness to perform the duties of the office—

In other words, there is a limitation on the number of professionals, and the number of clerks—

and said staff members shall be assigned to the chairman and ranking minority member of such committee as the committee may deem advisable. Each such committee is further authorized to terminate the services by a majority vote of the committee of any such professional staff member as it may see fit. Professional staff members shall not engage in any work other than committee business and no other duties may be assigned to them.

(B) Professional members for Committee on Appropriations, examinations of executive agencies' operation: Subject to appropriations which it shall be in order to include in appropriation bills, the Committee on Appropriations of each House is authorized to appoint such staff, in addition to the clerk thereof and assistants for the minority, as each such committee, by a majority vote, shall determine to be necessary, such personnel, other than the minority assistants, to possess such qualifications as the committees respectively may prescribe, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House also is authorized to conduct studies and examinations of the organization and operation of any executive agency (including any agency the majority of the stock of which is owned by the Government of the United States) as it may deem necessary to assist it in connection with the determination of matters within its jurisdiction and in accordance with the procedures authorized by the committee by a majority vote, including the rights and powers conferred by House Resolution Numbered 50, adopted January 9, 1945.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If that be the case, it appears to the Chair that the amendment would not be necessary.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I believe I still have the floor.

Mr. HAYDEN. May I be heard in response to the Senator from Michigan?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. THYE. When did the Senator from Minnesota lose the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has made a ruling on the point of order.

Mr. THYE. Then I appeal from the decision of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I merely wish to ask the Senator from Minnesota to withhold his appeal for a moment.

The section of the rule which was read by the Senator from Michigan clearly shows, it seems to me, that the Senate has the power to expand the staff of the Appropriations Committee if it desires to do so. The question was under consideration briefly yesterday in the Appropriations Committee when the legislative appropriation bill was under consideration. If I had not been detained upon the floor by the responsibility of trying to get the

pending bill passed, I would have discussed with the committee the propriety of expanding the staff of the Appropriations Committee for the purpose of doing what is proposed by the Senator, because I have a very clear feeling that the Appropriations Committee, which recommends the appropriations, ought to pursue the matter.

I am in complete agreement with the objectives of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], but I am wondering if it would not be a very good idea, in view of the great importance of the pending bill, and the substantive amendments which are still to be considered, for the Senator to withhold his amendment and present it again when the legislative bill comes up.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is on the floor. He is in charge of the legislative appropriation bill. He is thoroughly familiar with the Reorganization Act, and with all the rules of the Senate. I suggest to the Senator from Minnesota that it would expedite consideration of the pending appropriation bill and expedite the attainment of the objective the Senator has in mind, in all probability, if he would be good enough now to accept the decision of the Chair and let us proceed with the pending bill.

Mr. THYE. I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming that if we keep putting this subject off there will always be presented an argument why it should be put off again. The same argument could be made when the legislative appropriation bill comes before the Senate. I can see no better time than now to try to nail some safeguard to this huge appropriation bill.

Mr. President, anyone who has had governmental experience knows what it is going to be like when all the various agencies in the Defense Department proceed to spend \$61,000,000,000. It is for that reason, knowing that the members of the Appropriations Committee are oftentimes working more than they are physically fit to work, and far more than a man should be compelled to work, in their endeavors to obtain some information relative to the items in an appropriation bill, that there should be the addition to the staff which I propose. If the Committee on Appropriations is to act as a "watchdog committee," and if we are to ask the staff, which is already overworked, to proceed to an examination of all the installations and all the activities of the Defense Department, and if we are to have the type of inspection and investigation which the taxpayers are entitled to have, we shall definitely have to add to the staff of the Committee on Appropriations. We must have some experts in the field of accounting to give the members of the committee relief in their endeavors to find out how the funds are being expended. Therefore, I am reluctant to give up the fight, and I say we should not put it off any longer. Tomorrow will come, and another request will be made to put it off another day.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THYE. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. What the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], read shows that there is already a law on the statute books which provides that any time the Committee on Appropriations desires to do so, it can add to its personnel to whatever extent it may desire.

I thoroughly agree with what the Senator from Minnesota has said about the necessity of expanding the staff. After talking with other members of the committee, I am convinced that it should be done. However, we do not have to amend this bill to do it. Provisions for doing it is already on the statute books. We would merely be tacking to this bill a provision which is already contained in the law.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, if we have the timber, and if we have the tools, so to speak, let us go ahead and nail something together so that we will have it in service and operation. If we do that, we can determine whether we are getting a dollar's worth out of every dollar of appropriations we make.

I now yield to the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], who has been on his feet a long time.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I am in full agreement with the purposes of the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota. I have voted against many proposed cuts, and I intend to vote against many more, not that I disagree with the purposes of the cuts, but because I have had the feeling that in most cases they are clearly hit-and-miss cuts, and are not based on any facts known to any Member of the Senate, possibly with the exception of some members of the appropriate committees.

I do not believe that the Senate, when refusing to make cuts on a hit-and-miss basis, should be willing to surrender its control over at least the supervision of the expenditures which have been authorized by this body. Therefore I believe that it would be in the interest of good government and in the interest of economy, and possibly in the interest of increasing efficiency, if we adopted the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THYE. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota that I believe there can be no question that what he proposes would be legislation on an appropriation bill. The Parliamentarian has so advised us. It would be a bad precedent if, every time some of us were for or against the merits of a proposition, we decided to overrule the decision of the Chair. The rules of the Senate have been established for orderly procedure. The Senate cannot afford to overrule the Chair merely because his decision happens not to suit the ideas of some of us whenever we favor an amendment. If we did it in one instance, no doubt it would be done in other instances. Surely the Senate of the United States is not going to set the precedent of overruling decisions of the Chair, merely because the Chair's decision runs counter to the desires of some of us with regard to a certain proposition.

If I may have the further indulgence of my good friend from Minnesota, I desire to emphasize that I agree fully with his objective. Certainly we should watch carefully the expenditure of every tax dollar.

We know, of course that overlapping of functions and duties exists in many departments of the Government. However, merely because there is an overlapping in the departments of the Government is no excuse for the Senate to overlap in its work. We already have a "watchdog committee" which has done notable work. The distinguished members of the Armed Services Committee who are working under the chairmanship of the able junior Senator from Texas are experienced in this particular field.

I have the utmost confidence in the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] and the work that his subcommittee is doing. If we wish to expand the work of the Preparedness Subcommittee by providing a little more money and a somewhat larger staff, I believe that this subcommittee will meet the needs of the situation.

I realize that the field in which the Preparedness Subcommittee operates is one in which many Senators would like to participate. I also realize that frequently we let our desires prejudice our views, although I do not make that statement in respect to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, because I know he is trying to reach a certain goal. However, in all sincerity I say that the Senate cannot afford to change the rule by overriding the decision of the Presiding Officer, inasmuch as the rule is perfectly plain. I hope the Senate will not do so.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, let me say to the majority leader that I have no intention of casting a reflection upon any Member of the Senate and, in particular, I have not the slightest intention of casting any reflection upon the distinguished junior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON]. However, I had a feeling that his subcommittee was operating in an entirely different field from the one to which the amendment relates.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THYE. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I know the Senator from Minnesota is aware of Senate Resolution 18, which was submitted to the Senate in January of this year by the chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

Mr. THYE. Yes, I am aware of it, particularly in view of the fact that I have had a copy of it on my desk all day, in order that by my amendment I would not in any way invade the field covered by the resolution.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield further to me?

Mr. THYE. Certainly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Armed Services Committee has submitted a resolution creating a Preparedness Subcommittee, and that resolution has been

adopted. So far as I can tell, there is nothing in the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota that is not already covered by the resolution of the Armed Services Committee.

I have no disposition to ask the Senate not to appropriate to the Appropriations Committee whatever money it may need in order to have a proper staff. However, as I understand, the Appropriations Committee has made no such request.

At this moment the Armed Services Committee has a staff which has made approximately 30 reports, a copy of each of which has been sent to each Member of the Senate. From time to time the committee has asked the Senate to present its recommendations in regard to any matter which Senators felt should be investigated. I may say that not a day passes but that the Preparedness Subcommittee has dozens of requests for investigations from businessmen, private citizens, and from Members of the Senate. The staff of the Preparedness Subcommittee is presently engaged in studying and investigating all those complaints.

The amendment of the Senator from Minnesota would merely result in a duplication of the provisions of that resolution of the Armed Services Committee. We of the Preparedness Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee do not find that the scope or the power or the authority of the committee are such as to prevent us from making the desirable studies and investigations. The only thing which limits us in that respect is the funds available to us.

If the Senator from Minnesota wishes to have a more thorough or more exhaustive or more detailed investigation made, all he needs to do is to call upon the Committee on Rules and Administration and insist that it agree that the Armed Services Committee of the Senate be provided with the amount of money necessary to supervise the expenditure of the \$61,000,000,000 carried in this appropriation bill.

However, the Preparedness Subcommittee within the limit of its funds is going to do everything it possibly can to supervise the expenditure of the money in this appropriation bill. I believe that is what was intended by the Reorganization Act.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I have been on the floor of the Senate at least three times when the Senator from Texas has made a report from his Preparedness Subcommittee, and each of those reports was on the question of preparedness and defense, not on the question of how the military had expended any of the funds made available to them.

It was with the knowledge that we have received from that subcommittee reports regarding what was being done in military camps, that I submitted my amendment. I can recall when the Senator from Texas stated that our defense was not armor, but was only chicken wire. I recall that.

It is for those reasons that I submitted the amendment. I submitted it because the subcommittee was confining itself to the preparedness question, and I wish to

have set up a subcommittee staff which will have the specific duty of determining whether we were getting a dollar's worth of goods or services for each dollar of appropriations provided by the pending measure.

I wish to emphasize the point that I am not reflecting upon or attempting to reflect upon the Preparedness Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee. I pay them a tribute for doing the job called for by Senate Resolution 18, namely, determining whether we really are obtaining preparedness and whether we have sufficient strategic materials for that purpose. So I was not casting any reflection upon the committee.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me, to permit me to ask a question?

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan has been seeking recognition for some time. However, if he will pardon me for a moment, I should like to yield first to the Senator from Texas, to permit him to continue his statement.

Mr. FERGUSON. I have a proposal which may help dispose of this matter.

Mr. THYE. Very well; then I yield first to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. My proposal is that the appeal from the decision of the Chair be withdrawn by the Senator from Minnesota, and that he ask for the handling of this matter by the Appropriations Committee.

As I view the Senator's proposal, it contemplates something entirely different from what the Preparedness Subcommittee, headed by the Senator from Texas, is doing at this time.

So I hope the Senator from Minnesota will withdraw the amendment, and will offer it later in connection with the legislative appropriation bill. At that time I should like to join him in sponsoring the amendment, if it is offered in connection with the appropriations for the legislative branch.

Mr. THYE. I shall be most happy to do so.

It is not my intention to labor this point, Mr. President. However, before I take my seat, I should like to hear what the Senator from Texas has to say in commenting on my remarks. Therefore I yield to him at this time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I appreciate very much the nice things the Senator from Minnesota has said about our committee and about the Preparedness Subcommittee and its reports which he has observed. As a matter of fact, the Preparedness Subcommittee has made approximately 30 reports in the fields of manpower, housing, training, and materials. It was our feeling that the first studies should be in the fields of manpower and materials. The contracts which are made for procurement purposes relate to both manpower and materials, of course.

We now have under way investigations relating to the procurement field.

One of them involves the General Motors Corp., in connection with the production of a number of airplane motors.

We have felt that under this resolution we had complete authority to investigate everything the Senator from Minnesota contemplates.

If the Senator from Minnesota or the Senator from Michigan have in mind anything which they feel the committee has not considered, but should consider, the chairman of the Preparedness Subcommittee will be very glad to have them call it to his attention.

I wish to read two paragraphs of the resolution creating the Preparedness Subcommittee. If the Senator from Michigan and the Senator from Minnesota had read the resolution I think they would have realized that the Preparedness Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee now has adequate authority to do the very thing for which they are requesting authority and money.

I now read from the resolution:

It shall be the function of such subcommittee to conform with section 136 of such act by exercising a continuous watchfulness over matters within the jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee, through a continuous study of policies, programs, activities, operations, facilities, requirements, and practices of the Department of Defense, the armed services, and other agencies exercising functions relating to them and the administration thereof in all respects.

The purposes of such watchfulness and study shall include the determination whether (1) such policies, programs, activities, operations, facilities, requirements, and practices are the most effective possible in the interest of national defense; and (2) the administration of such policies, programs, activities, operations, facilities, requirements, and practices is characterized by maximum efficiency.

I say to the Senator from Minnesota that it is my thought that the amendment he proposes calls for an exact duplication of the function and authority which the preparedness subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee already has and already is exercising.

The able Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the able Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the able Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], on their side of the aisle, sit on that committee; and if there are any matters which we have overlooked, or if there is anything which the Senator wishes to have studied, but which has not been studied, within the limit of our funds—not within the limit of our authority, because we have ample authority to do everything his amendment contemplates, and it calls for a mere duplication of something which the Armed Services Committee has been doing since July 1950—we shall be glad to study it.

So it seems strange to me that we would spend hours talking about economy and about saving money in the executive departments of the Government and about avoiding duplication, and yet the Senate would consider creating two committees to do the same thing and to have the same authority and to make reports on the same matters.

It may be that the Armed Services Committee and its Preparedness Sub-

committee have not investigated everything the Senator from Minnesota would like to have us investigate. But all he needs to do, in order to have studied any subject within the purview of the Preparedness Subcommittee is to refer it to us. We have now many studies under way. It has been the feeling of the Senator from Texas that in the 12 months during which we have operated, with the 30 reports which we have submitted, going into the efficiency of operation of the Defense Department, going into its procurement and its contracts, going into its housing, and going into its utilization of manpower, we have served the purpose for which we were created.

I have no particular pride in this special subcommittee. If it is the feeling of the Senate that another committee should handle the matter, I should be very glad to give to that committee some of the hard work which we have been doing. I do want the Senate to know that it has one committee now which is doing the work, that \$190,000 has been appropriated for the work, and that 30 reports, covering a rather wide field, have been submitted during the past 12 months. The only thing that limits the operation of that committee is the matter of money.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I would say to the distinguished Senator from Texas that it has been my understanding and my observation that that subcommittee is itself dealing with the questions involving preparedness, whether we have strategic materials, and whether we have the supplies and all that is necessary in order to develop our defense. But the Appropriations Committee is the committee which ultimately must make the decisions on the appropriations. If we have erred in our judgment and have appropriated too much money, we are to be held responsible. If we have erred in our judgment and have not appropriated sufficient funds, we shall have to stand judgment for not providing the military and the armed services with the necessary funds with which to prepare themselves as they should have been prepared. So I say that the subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services is charged with the responsibility of examining into the question of the preparedness of our military forces, and it is not staffed for, and is not charged with, the responsibility of determining whether the dollars appropriated have been wisely spent.

Mr. President, in this day, when we are appropriating the billions of dollars which are called for by this bill and with the prospect of our spending \$100,000,000,000 on the defense program before we are finally through with it, if that is the sum of money we are to extract from the taxpayers, we need not only one committee for the study of the question of preparedness, but we need another committee to determine whether there was too much enthusiasm for preparedness and whether we are spending money which it might not have been necessary to spend.

But, Mr. President, in view of the fact that a point of order has been made, I shall not press the question further, but will take it up at some later time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, if no Senator present wishes to offer an amendment, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I am informed that the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] is prepared to proceed with his amendment. In view of that fact, and in view of the fact that there will be another opportunity for a quorum call before a final vote on the bill, I now ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I now call up my amendment designated "9-11-51-B."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 35, between lines 3 and 4, it is proposed to insert the following:

Total expenditures of funds appropriated by this paragraph shall be limited to 95 percent of the total amount appropriated by this paragraph.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, this is a proposal to introduce a further cut of 5 percent in the amount paid for civilian personnel of the Department of the Army at the seat of government here in Washington, D. C., in such offices as the Judge Advocate General's, The Adjutant General's, the Chief of Ordnance, and the like.

The history of this situation is as follows: As I understand, at the height of World War II, when there were between thirteen and fourteen million men in the armed services, there were approximately 23,000 civilian and military personnel in the Pentagon. That was in the ratio of 1 employee in the Pentagon for approximately 500 men in the Armed Forces as a whole. I do not know the present population of the Pentagon, and I suggest that it would be very interesting for the United States Census, if it has resources adequate to deal with this matter, to take such a census. But according to the last information I have, which is somewhat out of date, there are roughly 34,000 men and women in the Pentagon.

PROPORTION OF OVERHEAD PERSONNEL GREATER NOW THAN IN WORLD WAR II

The Armed Forces of the United States do not exceed 3,500,000, so that the ratio, therefore, is 1 Pentagonite for approximately every 100 persons in the armed services.

In other words, although we are engaged in what is certainly only a minor war, comparatively speaking, there are in the Pentagon employees in administrative positions in the ratio of 1 to 100 now as compared with 1 to 500 at the height of the greatest war in human history. While perhaps certain qualifications should be made, because in World War II the Navy was outside the Pentagon, and now has been largely

brought under the wing of the Department of Defense, that still does not entirely explain the difference.

Mr. President, the evidence indicates that there is approximately three times the overhead here in Washington now that there was at the height of World War II. There are approximately two divisions of people in the Pentagon. It is true that not all of them wear the uniform, but if they were not in the Pentagon, they could either be in the active services, or they could be in industries connected with the war effort.

Mr. President, I lament the fact that the Committee on Appropriations has only one staff member to deal with this huge \$61,000,000,000 appropriation. I hope that either the proposal of the Senator from Minnesota or that of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] to create a joint committee on the budget will be accepted, to have the appropriation groups adequately staffed so that we may know what we are doing. Both these Senators have made very constructive suggestions. I desire to include also the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. MOODY], because he joined in the suggestions made, I believe, with particular interest in the bill to create a joint budget committee, inasmuch as he is a member of the Senate Expenditures Committee which reported that bill.

OVERSTAFFING IN THE PENTAGON

If there is one matter upon which Senators are expert, I mean the common, garden-variety of us sitting here on the floor of the Senate, it is that there is overstaffing at the Pentagon. Everyone of us has constituents and friends at the Pentagon, and while they have a feeling of loyalty to the service for which they are working, nevertheless they have also a feeling of loyalty to the country, and they tell us upon occasion of the gross overstaffing which exists in the Pentagon.

I suppose no one is to blame for this. I suppose it is like Topsy, it has just "grewed."

I wish to make it clear that I am not reflecting on the patriotism of those at the Pentagon. I hope it will not be said that I am attacking their character. I certainly am not. They are excellent men and women, I am sure, highly devoted to duty, highly patriotic. I am sure the percentage of church membership among them is as high as that to be found in our citizenship as a whole. I am sure they are kind to their wives and children. I have been in the homes of some of them, and I can testify that they take good care of the flowers in their gardens, and that the pansies and petunias they raise are just as good as those raised by anyone. So I wish to make it perfectly clear that I am not attacking the character of these people. And I hope I am not impeding the war effort by suggesting that there are too many of them in the Pentagon.

That is the whole point—there are too many of them there.

Mr. President, what I am trying to do is to cut out one of the major diseases of the military system, which is the tendency to expand personnel in the upper echelons. The amendment which I suggest would save about \$3,354,000—peanuts, to be sure, but it would re-

lease over a battalion. The amendment would affect civilian personnel, and its adoption would mean the release of the equivalent of over a battalion of people to more productive service.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wonder whether the Senator's amendment has not been taken care of already, because the limit has been reduced from 530,000 to 500,000, and there is a provision that it covers personnel, temporary, as well as permanent, and also consultants, which probably will result in reducing the number even more than would be accomplished by the Senator's amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I believe the proposal to which the Senator from Michigan refers is the so-called 5-percent cut as applied to the civilian employees as a whole under a directive issued by Assistant Secretary of Defense Anna Rosenberg, but what I am trying to reduce, specifically, is the number of civilian employees at the seat of Government, and to impose a further 5-percent cut in the salaries of Army officers in the Pentagon.

Mr. President, when the various congressional committees went into the question of the overstaffing of the Pentagon, that gave strength to the hope that Mrs. Rosenberg would impose a 5-percent cut in the total personnel, civilian and military, in the Pentagon, to take effect in July. That order has gone into effect, and I want to pay tribute to Mrs. Rosenberg for doing what she did. Probably she would not have been able to prevail upon her colleagues in the Pentagon had it not been for the assistance which Congress gave her, but it was a very good act on the part of Congress, and she has carried it out excellently.

Mr. President, I desire to point out, if I may, that at the instance of the senior Senator from Michigan we have imposed a 10-percent cut on personnel in civilian agencies, but the Army thought it was making a great concession when it agreed to a 5-percent cut in the Pentagon. I should also like to point out, if I may, that probably there is as much overstaffing in the military agencies in Washington as there is in the civilian agencies. Since we have applied a 10-percent cut to the civil branch of the Government, it would seem, in all fairness, that we should also apply a 10-percent cut to the Military Establishment here in Washington. This amendment is directed only to civilian employees. It does not deal with military employees.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I think the Senator from Illinois was not on the floor when an amendment was adopted to reduce the 530,000 limitation to 500,000. We have also reduced the number by including not only full-time civilians, but part-time consultants. So we have, in effect, I think, reduced the number approximately 10 percent.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may state to the Senator from Michigan that I am very

glad that amendment was adopted. I was not on the floor when it was agreed to. But the reduction to which he invites attention is a reduction in number of personnel, and applies the country over, not merely in Washington.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is not a reduction in amount of money. The amendment which I offer provides for a reduction of a further 5 percent in the amount of money.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan feels that the amendment of the Senator from Illinois can be accepted, because it would be in line with the amendment to which I have just referred.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct. I am glad the amendment restricting personnel has been adopted. My amendment would seal that achievement and restrict the appropriation of money for Army offices in the Pentagon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to confirm what the Senator from Michigan has said, that the Senate by its action on the general over-all personnel ceiling seems to have accomplished what the senior Senator from Illinois desires to accomplish by his amendment. The history of what happened while the Senator was off the floor was this: That the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] offered an amendment providing for an over-all 10 percent cut. Discussion ensued during which the whole matter was rather thoroughly explored, as I thought, and the junior Senator from Illinois finally was persuaded that the members of the committee were correct in their point of view, and he changed his amendment. He abandoned the proposal to make an over-all 10-percent cut, instead of the 5-percent cut the Senator from Illinois seeks, and accepted in lieu thereof the reduction of the original committee amendment from 530,000 to 500,000.

There is another reason why I feel that the Senator's amendment should not be adopted at this point, and I hope I may be able to persuade him that I am correct. We have already adopted amendments which have increased the personnel because of perfectly understandable reasons. For example, in the Office of the Secretary of the Army we increased the appropriation so as to provide twelve additional employees whose duty would be to carry on the renegotiation of contracts involving these huge sums.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If the Senator will read my amendment, he will find that I am reducing by 5 percent the total amounts appropriated by the paragraph in question, not the individual amounts appropriated in the specific lines of the paragraph. The Secretary of the Army would have discretionary power to apportion these cuts as he thought best. So that if there are particular sections in the top Army officers in the Penta-

gon which are understaffed—it seems incredible to believe that there are any sections in the Pentagon that are understaffed—but if there are, those can be exempted, and the cut would be an overall figure of \$3,354,000, which could be apportioned amongst the various sections and divisions.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let us consider the Office of the Chief of Ordnance. There the request was for a restoration of \$367,000. We denied that request and allowed only \$250,000. In the case of the Quartermaster General, he wanted a restoration of 122 persons. We allowed a restoration of only 61. In the Office of the Judge Advocate General the committee recommended a total increase of eight persons for the purpose of implementing the new law providing for an appellate procedure. All in all, these increases authorized by the committee in this paragraph amount to about \$860,000.

The total amount carried in this particular appropriation is—

Mr. DOUGLAS. Sixty-seven million seventy-nine thousand nine hundred dollars.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Illinois is quite correct.

My own feeling is that because of what we have already done the Senator's amendment is not necessary. But if the Senator insists upon the amendment I am willing to accept it and take it to conference.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Wyoming, and I will make the conventional reply that I hope he takes it to conference with a strong heart and not with the intention of strangling the amendment to death in the tower.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I think I may be permitted to say to the Senator from Illinois that I believe I have a strong heart. I can take the things that happen on the floor. It has not been my practice to speak out of two sides of my mouth.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Wyoming.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Moody in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois lettered "B."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I now offer my amendment 9-10-51-K, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 39, line 10, it is proposed to strike "\$1,050,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,003,356,000."

On page 40, line 3, it is proposed to strike "\$1,537,452,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,526,952,000."

On page 41, line 17, it is proposed to strike "\$1,335,668,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,320,468,000."

On page 47, line 9, it is proposed to strike "\$3,215,800,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$3,104,850,000."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection—

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I thought the Senator from Illinois was going to explain the amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I had intended to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, this is a very substantial cut of almost \$50,000,000 in the appropriation for the construction of aircraft and related procurement. I cannot bring myself to accept the amendment because it deals with one of the most vital aspects of this appropriation bill. If there is one thing upon which the committee was unanimous it was upon its desire to make certain that the United States has an expanded Air Force. This is a provision that deals specifically with the Air Force of the Navy. If the amendment were to be adopted it would mean a reduction of some \$47,000,000. It would be a vote to cut 60 aircraft from the expansion of naval air power, or in more realistic terms, it would be the equivalent of 4 modern fighter squadrons. In view of the great need for the expansion of air power, I think the amendment of the Senator from Illinois should not be adopted.

AMENDMENT AIMED AT REDUCING GOVERNMENT PURCHASES OF MACHINERY

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I am afraid that our good friend the Senator from Wyoming and his associates have misunderstood the nature of the amendment. It is not directed at reducing the number of aircraft. It is directed at an area of the budget called expediting production. At least it bears that title in the Army budget, although it carries a different name in the Navy and Air Force, and in those services it is not carried as a separate item in the bill. Instead it is included within other items in the bill, which is why I have had to offer four separate amendments. Under the items which include funds for this purpose of the military asked for a total of approximately \$3,000,000,000 to purchase tools, equipment and machinery to which the Government will hold title, but which will be used by the contractors in producing for the various branches of the military service. It is also going to be used to build or to rehabilitate Government-owned plants, primarily for the production of highly classified items.

Mr. President, in the remarks I made on Monday I pointed out that this appropriation of \$3,000,000,000 which the Defense Department is requesting, is in addition to the some nine and a third billion dollars of accelerated tax amortization which have already been granted by the Defense Production Administration. It is in addition to the loan guaranties which have been granted, and to the direct loans which either have been or will be granted. It is an appropriation by the Government to furnish tools, equipment and machinery, to put these into private establishments, the private establishments then using them.

Then, of course, the question always comes up: What is to happen to them after the war? While some of these will have a specialized wartime use, there are others, such as heavy presses for aircraft, which can be made available for peacetime work, as well as for wartime work. It seems to me that for machinery which is useful in peacetime, such as heavy presses, lathes, drills, and so

forth, we need not spend so much money. Rather, we can provide incentive to concerns through direct loans and accelerated amortization tax certificates. The same holds true for plant construction.

After the last war a great deal of this equipment for which we spent a total of \$7,500,000,000 was sold at ridiculously low figures to the industrial concerns which had used them during the war. Certainly some of this equipment must still be in existence, but this is a proposal to spend \$3,000,000,000 more.

When this question was submitted to the House, the House Appropriations Committee made a 10-percent cut in the budget request of approximately \$1,100,000,000 for this purpose for the Army, but it did not make a corresponding cut in the one-billion-eight-hundred-million-odd dollars requested for the Navy and the Air Force. I think this may possibly have been a mere technical oversight on the part of the House. It seems to me logical that it intended to make a 10 percent across the board. This is highly probable, since the item for the Army is labeled as "Expediting production" while the items for the same purpose in the Navy and Air Force sections of the bill are included in other headings. This is pointed up by the fact that the House committee in its report, specifically directed that this program be reevaluated. Since the principle involved is precisely the same for the Navy and the Air Force, one might surmise the House wanted the program reevaluated across the board, although I cannot speak for the House.

I cannot see how our holding back 10 percent on these appropriations will appreciably reduce the number of aircraft produced. It seems to me that this is an attempt to put a little checkrein on, to see that the money is not lavished as widely as it otherwise would be, and that more careful exploration of other expansion incentives, such as accelerated amortization or loan guaranties, particularly in the case of equipment with probable peacetime usefulness.

We remember the colloquy when the Senator from Connecticut, in connection with the Defense Production Act, proposed that the Government, through DPA and NPA, should have the power of directly constructing industrial plants. His proposal, I believe, involved only a few hundred million dollars. That was turned down by a vote of this body, and some rather severe language was applied to it by certain Members of the Senate. Now we have a proposal for many, many times that amount—\$3,000,000,000, to be expended through the Defense Department, for much the same purpose except that the potential benefits to private concerns is greater. What I am trying to do is to say that if this is socialism, my proposal is to have 10 percent less socialism, than we otherwise would have. In that process \$183,000,000 would be saved.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, let me add that I quite agree with the Senator from Illinois in his general attitude toward the excessive certificates of amortization which have been granted to many corporations which may be engaged in defense production. The Senator, as a member of the Joint Economic Committee, is well aware of that fact.

But I have no reason to believe that an appropriation which is contained in this bill for the purchase of machine tools has anything in the world to do with the excessive profits which may be reaped by reason of such certificates of convenience and necessity. The way to attack excessive profits from war contracts is by way of renegotiation, in the first place, for which we have provided, and in the second place, by way of taxation. When the tax bill comes before the Senate I think we shall have an opportunity to make certain that any excessive profits which may be reaped from war contracts may be recovered and paid into the revenue of the Federal Government.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. CASE. The point which the Senator from Wyoming is making shows the essential difference between working on excess profits by renegotiation and by the excess-profits tax. The excess-profits tax is by its nature a percentage proposition, which applies to all producers and all plants indiscriminately. Renegotiation makes it possible to take into consideration whether the investment in the plant is a private investment of the plant owner, or whether a part of the plant capital is provided by the Government. That is the use of the renegotiation process.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from South Dakota is quite right. As was stated earlier in the day, the Senator from South Dakota was largely responsible in the House during World War II for the adoption of the renegotiation procedure.

My point with respect to this amendment, however, is that by reducing the appropriation for the procurement of machine tools we necessarily lower the ability of the aircraft manufacturer to produce the aircraft which are needed. I think that the amendment is excessive. If the machine tools are not produced, then the production of aircraft will necessarily be reduced, and I believe my original statement is altogether correct, that it would involve a reduction of \$47,000,000, which could be converted, in terms of reduction of the number of aircraft produced, into a reduction of 60 aircraft, or four modern fighter squadrons.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I was present in the subcommittee hearing when this very item was discussed. I realize that it involves a tremendous sum of money. It might seem possible to bring about an economy in this item; but we are engaged in a cold-war operation. If we devote our plants to maximum production, we may create vast yards full of equipment, such as planes, tanks, and what have you, which will stand idle and deteriorate. In the event that we should need tools, plants, and equipment for all-out production, we could not find a substitute. We could not then proceed to tool. We could not then proceed to get the plant facilities to bring about all-out

production if the emergency should require it. So while we are appropriating today, we are oftentimes appropriating for facilities for all-out production, but facilities which will be operated at a more or less limited capacity. That is the only way we can deal with the problem during the cold-war period with which we are faced.

While the item which is now before us in the appropriation bill was being discussed by the armed services, some of the information given us was highly classified and off the record. It could not be printed in the public report which is before us. The chairman of the subcommittee asked hundreds of questions of the military authorities, and the questions and answers do not appear in this record, because the information was classified.

Mr. President, I admire the senior Senator from Illinois in his efforts to bring about economy. While I should like to support him, and while it is embarrassing to many of us when we do not support the economy effort, yet I know, as a member of the subcommittee, that we felt, after all the testimony had been taken, that we were entirely justified in writing into the appropriation bill the items which now appear in it.

I will say to the senior Senator from Illinois that if I vote against him, as I shall do on this amendment, I shall do so regretfully, knowing very well that my vote will be misunderstood by every taxpayer when he reads the newspaper columns stating that members of the Appropriations Committee voted against the effort of the Senator from Illinois to economize.

However, I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Illinois that much testimony was given us in the hearings which does not appear in this record. The chairman of the subcommittee spent many hours personally questioning the military authorities, in his endeavor to get all the facts and to squeeze out every dollar that could be squeezed out of the appropriation. So I say again that when I vote against the distinguished Senator from Illinois on this amendment, as I shall do in connection with some of the other amendments, I do so reluctantly, but I do so because I know that we got all the information from the armed services, and that we felt, as members of the subcommittee, justified in recommending these items to the full committee; and the full committee saw fit to make the recommendations to the Senate.

Mr. DOUGLAS obtained the floor.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, in the event consideration of the pending bill is not completed today—and it is evident that it will not be finished—that beginning tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon debate be limited to 30 minutes on each amendment, motion, or appeal, 15 minutes to be allotted to each side, to be controlled by the proponent of the amendment or

motion, and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]; provided that in the event the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] favors the amendment or motion, the time in opposition be controlled by the distinguished minority leader the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], or any other Senator acting in his place; provided further that debate on the bill be limited to 30 minutes, to be divided equally between the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and the distinguished minority leader the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], or any Senator he may designate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Reserving the right to object, I know of no objection on this side of the aisle. I believe the Senator from North Dakota may have something to say on the subject. The Senator from North Dakota has just returned to the Chamber. Will the Senator from Arizona repeat his unanimous-consent request?

Mr. LANGER. I know what it is. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Michigan a question. I wonder if the Senator from Michigan intends to propose an amendment to cut 10 percent from this bill.

Mr. FERGUSON. No; it was not my intention to do so with respect to this bill. The reason for it is that while this is an enormous bill, much of it is for equipment and supplies, and the Senator from Michigan feels that this is a matter that must be left generally to the military authorities.

After a very close and thorough examination by the various members of the committee I have been compelled to come to the conclusion that it would be impossible to do it under the circumstances at this time, considering the question of defense of America, as I see it. We did reduce the civilian personnel today, as the Senator from Michigan had proposed to do in committee, by approximately 10 percent. We have reduced the number from 546,000 to approximately 500,000, and we have put a limitation on the number. We have applied the cut to consultants and part time employees. In effect we have reduced the civilian personnel by 10 percent, which is in line with what the Senator from Michigan provided in his previous amendments.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator from Michigan know of any other Senator who will offer such an amendment?

Mr. FERGUSON. I believe the Senator from Vermont intends to do so.

Mr. FLANDERS. I should like to say that I plan to make—and I have announced that I shall make—a motion, which will have the effect of making a 10-percent reduction. It will be before the Senate in a somewhat different form, owing to circumstances of contractual obligations of the Government, and things of that sort. I assure the Senator from North Dakota, if he is interested, that he will have an opportunity to vote on an equivalent 10 percent cut.

Mr. LANGER. With the time being divided, could the Senator from Vermont

yield 5 minutes to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. FLANDERS. Yes. I am glad to yield 5 minutes to him. I do so right now.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I do not wish to object, but I do not like a limitation of 30 minutes of debate on the bill.

Mr. McFARLAND. I am willing to make it longer.

Mr. GEORGE. Does the unanimous-consent agreement provide for a total of 30 minutes of debate on the bill?

Mr. McFARLAND. A total of 30 minutes on the bill. The bill has been debated for 3 days.

Mr. GEORGE. I understand. Under the circumstances I would be obliged to object to such a limitation, because it would be impossible, if any Senator wanted to speak on the bill, to be recognized for 10, 15, or 20 minutes.

Mr. McFARLAND. I shall extend the time for a limitation of debate on the bill to 1 hour. That is the usual time provided for debate on a bill under a unanimous-consent agreement. The time, of course, would be divided equally.

Mr. GEORGE. I believe that on a bill of this character any Member of the Senate who wishes to speak on it finally should have the right to speak. If only 15 minutes of debate is permitted to a side it would be impossible to be recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. McFARLAND. I have amended the request to extend the debate on the bill to 1 hour.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Would an hour be agreeable to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. GEORGE. I am anxious to help expedite the consideration of the bill. It is quite likely that I shall wish to take 15 or 20 minutes on the bill. It is a very important bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I quite agree with the Senator from Georgia. I believe the Senator from Georgia is perfectly right in feeling that discussion of a bill of this importance, with its vast implications, should not be limited to such a narrow scope as originally proposed. The majority leader is quite willing to extend the time.

I was going to suggest the possibility that debate on the bill should be limited to the time that any Senator desires to take.

Mr. GEORGE. I would have no objection to 15 minutes for any Senator desiring to speak.

Mr. McFARLAND. I would prefer to make the time limit on the bill an hour and a half. When we have a limitation applied to Senators, they may rise and speak about matters other than the bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to interrupt him?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I believe that if he will modify the unanimous-consent request, particularly the latter part of it, to provide that debate upon the bill shall be limited to 15 minutes to each Senator who chooses to speak on it, but that his debate must be germane to the bill—

Mr. McFARLAND. I believe we should conform to the usual form of unanimous-consent requests. I have no particular objection, but if the Senator from Georgia desires to use 15 minutes, and if an hour and a half should be provided on each side—

Mr. GEORGE. I do not know that I shall use any time, but I deem this to be a very important bill. It is the most staggering bill the Senate has ever considered. All through World War I did we in one bill ever appropriate as much as \$61,000,000,000.

Mr. McFARLAND. Does the Senator believe that an hour and a half for debate on the bill, with three-quarters of an hour on each side, would be sufficient?

Mr. GEORGE. Just so any Senator who wanted to take 15 or 20 minutes would be recognized for that length of time. I believe an hour or an hour and a half would be ample.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, as acting minority leader, in view of what the Senator from Georgia has said, and after discussing the subject with Senators on this side of the aisle, I hope the Senator from Arizona will be willing to make it an hour to each side, or a total of 2 hours of debate on the bill itself. Probably not all the time will be used, but at least we would have that much time available. I would have to object to the suggestion of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], because deciding what is germane and what is not germane sometimes leads to unpleasantness. I know because I occupied the chair in my home State for 8 years. It would be much better to have a limitation without the necessity of having anyone decide what is or what is not germane.

Mr. McFARLAND. I have no objection to a limitation of 15 minutes, without germaneness, but we have more or less established a pattern with respect to limitations on debate, and the pattern has worked out very well.

Mr. GEORGE. I believe an hour to each side would be ample. I assume I shall be able to be recognized for 15 minutes if I desire to speak.

Mr. McFARLAND. I hope that we will not use all of 2 hours in debate on the bill itself. It is an important bill, as has been suggested by the Senator from Georgia; and because of its importance I have not up to this time suggested that we enter into a unanimous-consent agreement. However, I think the time has arrived when the bill should be passed.

I amend my request to provide for an hour of debate on each side on the bill itself.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is agreeable to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request proposed by the Senator from Arizona, as modified?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Reserving the right to object, I understand that the time allotted to amendments refers also to motions.

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes, to motions and appeals. Of course, that is under the 30-minute limitation.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the proposal is for a 30-minute limitation on amendments and for a limitation of 1 hour to each side on the bill.

The question is on agreeing to the unanimous-consent proposal, as modified. Without objection, it is agreed to.

The unanimous-consent agreement, as reduced to writing, is as follows:

Ordered, That, beginning at the hour of 12 o'clock noon on the calendar day of Thursday, September 13, 1951, debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, proposed to H. R. 5054, the Department of Defense Appropriation Act for 1952, shall be limited to not exceeding 30 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and Mr. O'MAHONEY, respectively; but in the event he is in favor of any such amendment or motion the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by Mr. WHERRY, or someone acting in his behalf; and that debate on the question of the final passage of the bill shall be limited to not exceeding 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by Mr. O'MAHONEY and Mr. WHERRY, respectively, or someone acting in Mr. WHERRY's behalf.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment K of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, without particular regard to this amendment, let me say to the Senator from Minnesota that I am sure he should do exactly what he intends to do, namely, vote in accordance with his convictions and his knowledge. That is what all of us should do.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The announcement of the unanimous-consent agreement seems to have been taken by many Members of the Senate as a signal to leave the floor. It had been my hope that we would continue in session until at least 6 p. m. this evening. I was hoping that in the meantime we might dispose of the pending amendment of the Senator from Illinois. So I wish Senators to know that we are likely to have a vote on the amendment.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. First, I should like to complete my statement, and then yield.

Mr. CASE. My question is a very simple one, namely, whether the Senator would consider splitting his amendment. Some of the items of the amendment appeal to me, but one or two of them present some difficulties to me and raise some doubts in my mind.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It would be rather complicated if I were to split the amendment. I prefer to submit the amendment as a whole at this time. Perhaps later it can be considered in the way the Senator from South Dakota suggests.

Mr. President, I was about to say that I hope the Senator from Minnesota will do exactly as is his intention, namely, to vote according to his convictions. I am sure no one will question the sincerity

of the Senator from Minnesota if he votes against the amendment I have proposed. Certainly no one would have a right to raise such a question; and I assure the Senator that, for myself, I would not question his sincerity. All of us proceed on the assumption that we do that which seems best to us, and we do not question the votes of our colleagues.

I say with all humility that I do not pretend to have complete knowledge regarding this bill or the subjects with which it deals. My knowledge is definitely limited. I try not to take too much time in submitting motions or amendments; and if they are rejected, I shall accept in good faith the decision of the Senate.

So far as concerns what has been stated by the Senator from Minnesota, very likely the Senator from Minnesota would know better than I do about particular questions.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, in reply to the Senator from Illinois, let me say that I know that each of us who is privileged to serve the particular State he represents acts in accordance with his best judgment and ability. If it is the judgment of any Member of the Senate that he should submit an amendment calling for either a reduction or an increase in the size of an appropriation item, certainly that is the best judgment of that particular Senator, and I respect it.

As a member of the subcommittee, I can only say that after many, many weeks of hearings we were reluctant to accede to the requests of the Department of Defense in regard to such a huge appropriation bill as this one. However, after all the facts were laid before us, we submitted our report and recommendation on the bill is the best upon which we could agree. In the event we vote against amendments submitted by the distinguished Senator from Illinois, we do so only because we are exercising our best judgment in regard to these questions.

I commend the Senator from Illinois for his efforts to economize. When we are considering a \$61,000,000,000 appropriation bill relating to the Defense Establishment—and the \$61,000,000,000 this bill provides are far from the total amount which will be provided for the Defense Establishment—I say we need examine the items contained in the bill most carefully and we need the best efforts of all Senators in connection with the examination of the bill and to make certain that no one has erred.

That is the reason why I was proposing a watchdog committee, so as to make certain that if someone has erred, such a committee can catch up any errors made along the way in connection with the appropriations for the Military Establishment, because when that Establishment begins to expend \$61,000,000,000, it will have at its disposal such huge sums of money that it will be quite easy for it to be a little liberal at times. Therefore, I hope someone will make certain that the Defense Establishment is not too liberal with the taxpayers' money.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment K, submitted by the Senator from Illinois. The Chair understands that the various parts of the amendment are to be considered en bloc.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, it is precisely for the reason just stated by the Senator from Minnesota that I question the appropriation which is recommended by the committee for this particular item.

UNEXPENDED BALANCES FROM FISCAL 1951 APPROPRIATIONS FOR THIS PROGRAM

I should like to remind the Senate that for the fiscal year 1951 we appropriated \$1,100,000,000 for precisely the same purpose, so the Army alone, namely, the purchase of tools and equipment. If my information is correct, out of that amount, judging from the figures on page 7 of the budget document, House Document No. 120, only \$15,000,000 was expended in the fiscal year 1951, leaving unexpended approximately \$1,000,000,000 of the amount appropriated; and it is expected that only approximately \$500,000,000 of that amount will be expended during the fiscal year 1952, for which we are legislating at this time. In other words, there will be a carry-over to the fiscal year 1953 of approximately \$500,000,000.

I think the point made by the Senator from Florida is on sound constitutional grounds, namely, that appropriations for the Armed Forces cannot be made for more than 2 years. Therefore, instead of carrying over to the fiscal year 1953 approximately \$500,000,000, which we appropriated for this item for the Defense Establishment for the fiscal year 1951, I think that amount must be spent during the fiscal year 1952.

In addition to that amount, the Defense Establishment now requests nearly \$3,000,000,000 for fiscal year 1952. Of course, only a fraction of that amount can be spent during the present fiscal year, an estimated \$300,000,000, according to the budget document. The effect of making so large an appropriation, far in excess of the anticipated rate of expenditure, at this time may circumvent the necessity for an additional authorization of appropriations. Therefore, a reduction of the appropriation for this item seems to me to be thoroughly wise, in view of the fact that there are amounts of \$500,000,000 for this purpose appropriated in fiscal 1951 which will not even be spent in fiscal 1952, plus an additional \$500,000,000 from fiscal 1951 to be spent this year for the Army alone. When these are added to the \$3,000,000,000 requested for fiscal 1952, they make a total of over \$4,000,000,000 now unexpended, but available for this purpose.

Mr. President, after this item was cut \$100,000,000 by the House, I wonder whether the Army appealed from that cut. The Army was told to accept the 10-percent cut, but a similar cut was not imposed upon the Air Force or the Navy. I note that the Senate committee did not see fit to restore the Army's 10-percent cut for this item and that which makes me believe that a 10-percent cut could with profit be imposed upon the

appropriations for the Air Force and the Navy.

Therefore, I believe we could do exactly what the Senator from Minnesota has suggested, namely, reduce to some extent the billions of dollars loosely appropriated, which the military will have to play with, and which may tempt them into lavish habits of expenditure without fully exploring other means of financing expansion of productive facilities.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes; or I shall be glad to yield the floor.

Mr. HUNT. I should like to ask the Senator from Illinois a question. I wonder what he means by saying that these sums are loosely appropriated.

I have before me the committee hearings, which constitute one thousand nine hundred-odd pages of printed testimony. I know the committee has been working on this bill since May, and has asked thousands upon thousands of questions. So in my judgment the money is not being loosely appropriated. I think the committee has done an excellent job.

I do not know how the Senator from Illinois arrives at the figures he seemingly pulls out of the air, to include in the amendments he proposes. I do not know how many hearings he conducts or how much expert testimony is given to him.

The Senator from Illinois describes his amendments in broad generalities. He gets great credit from the press, while those of us who try to follow the recommendations of the committee, which has given such excellent study and attention to the bill, are criticized by the press when we do not go along with the proposals of the Senator from Illinois.

However, my main point is that I wish to contest the statement made by the Senator from Illinois, namely, that these moneys are loosely appropriated.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Wyoming for his comment. Perhaps it would be the wiser personal thing for the Senator from Illinois to keep silent when these matters come to the floor of the Senate, and not to propose any reductions in the items.

Mr. HUNT. I would not say that.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Then the Senator from Illinois would be much more popular with the military and with the civil service, and, no doubt, with his colleagues.

Mr. HUNT. No; but I believe that when the Senator from Illinois submits such an amendment as the one which now is pending he should give to the Senate the testimony upon which he bases the figures at which he arrives in connection with the amendment.

I do not like to be accused by the press of being a spender, when I do not vote for a reduction, which is contrary to the Appropriation Committee's recommendation, and when I feel that the Senator from Illinois has simply picked the figure out of the sky.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Wyoming certainly should not be accused in that fashion. The Senator from

Illinois will never so accuse him, and I hope no one else will. In brief, what I have said is that, since a 10-percent cut was applied by the House to the Army, I have heard no reason why it should not also be applied to the Air Force and to the Navy. The Army item which was cut was a specific item in the bill. I see no reason for exempting the Navy and the Air Force from the same cut simply because their requests for the same type of expenditures are covered up in other items in the bill. I also pointed out that we have \$500,000,000 of appropriations for the Army for this purpose carrying over from last year, which, according to the estimates in the President's budget document, will not even be spent in fiscal 1952, and which certainly, therefore, should allow us safely to diminish the amounts which we are appropriating for fiscal 1952.

So far as my own study of this matter is concerned, I have gone over the details, here. Without betraying any confidence, I may say that in the Air Force expenditures alone, \$235,000,000 of the appropriations are for undetermined, unspecified projects, with the program not specifically set. I would think, therefore, that it might have been the military which had brought these figures out of the hat, rather than the Senator from Illinois. I submit that this particular reduction is well justified.

Mr. HUNT. The Senator from Illinois is well aware of the fact that testimony has been given to the committee which is not available to him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I ask for a division.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A division is requested.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Do I correctly understand from the Senator from Illinois that he is presenting his amendment as a single amendment, or is he dividing it?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I hope the Senator from Illinois will be content to present the first item, on lines 1 and 2 of the amendment, because the other amendments cover ships and facilities, ordnance and facilities, aircraft, and related procurement for the Air Force, which constitute four different items in four different parts of the bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is true, but they are for the same purpose. They are not for the direct construction of aircraft and ships, but for the furnishing of tools, implements, and equipment, and for the building of plants. I hope I have made the legislative record clear on that point.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Very well.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Following up what the Senator from Wyoming has said, two, and I think three of the Senator's amendments relate to aircraft; the other one relates to ship construction. I

observe, frankly, that I should like to vote with the Senator on the ship construction item, but if he includes them all together in one amendment, I shall have to vote against it, because I think the proposal applicable to aircraft should not be agreed to.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I suggest that we vote first on the aircraft items and vote, second, on the naval and ordnance items, if that is satisfactory to the Chair and to the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator designate on which item he desires the vote to be taken first?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the Senator from Illinois is withdrawing for the moment the amendments beginning in line 3 and beginning in line 5 of his amendment, so that the vote will now be confined to his proposal to reduce by \$47,000,000 the item for aircraft and related procurement for the Navy, beginning in line 1, and his proposal to reduce by more than \$100,000,000 the appropriation for aircraft and related procurement for the Air Force, beginning in line 7. Do I correctly understand the Senator?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say the bill is somewhat complicated.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is what I am trying to tell the Senator.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Illinois was aware that it is a complicated bill. He is an inexperienced traveler through the dark forest, but he is trying to be prepared. The item on page 39, line 10, comes under the appropriation heading "Construction of aircraft and related procurement" under the Navy. I cannot emphasize too strongly that I do not intend that the funds for the procurement of naval aircraft should be reduced by one cent. My amendment is directed at the program described under this heading as "Procurement and installation of equipment in public or private plants," which language may be found on lines 7 and 8 on page 39. The amount budgeted for this, according to figures on page 1265 of the House hearings on the Navy is \$466,442,000, which I am proposing to reduce by 10 percent, to conform with the House cut for the Army.

I am perfectly willing to have that considered by itself, but I ask the Senate to remember that the reduction would be made in funds for expediting construction, not actual procurement.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Very well. It is my understanding now, Mr. President, that the only amendment we are voting on is that presented in lines 1 and 2 of the Senator's amendment, namely, on page 39, line 10, to strike "\$1,050,000,000" and insert "\$1,003,356,000," a reduction of approximately \$47,000,000 for the production of naval aircraft.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the understanding of the Chair. The question is on agreeing to the amendment. A division has been requested.

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the next amendment is on page 40, line 3, and deals with ships and facilities; but

again I want to remind the Senate that it is not a proposal to reduce direct appropriations for ships and facilities, but merely to decrease the amount of free machinery, equipment and plant facilities furnished to concerns which will construct ships. The portion of the "Ships and facilities" appropriation that I intend to reduce is described in lines 20, 21, and 22 on page 39 of the bill as follows: "procurement of plant equipment, appliances, and machine tools, and installation thereof in public or private plants."

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. The purpose of the amendment is not quite clear to me.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am trying to reduce by 10 percent the amounts allocated for the purchase of machinery, equipment, and facilities which will be turned over to industrial concerns, with which to produce ships, to parallel approximately the 10 percent reduction which has already been proposed by the House with respect to the Army, and which the Senate committee did not restore. If it is asked why this cut should only be \$10,500,000, when the appropriation provided in the bill is \$1,537,452,000, it is because, as shown on page 1265 of the House Navy hearings, and by the detailed report, the item for this particular program comes to only \$105,000,000, and I am proposing to cut it 10 percent, as the House did in the case of the Army.

Mr. CAPEHART. I understand the items referred to are items of machinery with which to produce aircraft.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In this case they are items of machinery and plant facilities to produce ships.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Government will retain title to the machinery and will simply loan it to the manufacturer, will it not?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes. But we know what happened after the last war. Equipment was sold to industrial concerns at a very, very low figure.

Mr. CAPEHART. My question is, No private company would buy that machinery itself, would it, because it would have no need for it, except for war-production purposes?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Much of the equipment is not specialized in nature, but it can be used for peacetime production. It is not all unique equipment, useful only for the making of weapons of war. Some of it can be used for peacetime purposes.

Mr. CAPEHART. And the Government will retain title to it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes. The question is, how long it will retain title to it after the war is over.

Mr. CAPEHART. What would happen if there were a refusal to buy machinery in order to build ships? How, then, would the Government secure the building of ships? I do not know whether the machinery is now available. I am proceeding on the assumption that the Navy Department proved that the machinery is not now available, and therefore it has to be created or pur-

chased by the industry, or the Government has to buy it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That, undoubtedly, is the theory upon which the Department of Defense is proceeding, and it should be noted that I am not proposing to eliminate this item, but am leaving 90 percent of it intact. I am not saying this program is entirely based on an incorrect theory; I am saying that it is based on a theory which may lend itself to great abuse. That is something about which we should stop, look, and listen before we embark on this program. A 10-percent cut in the amount, particularly in view of unexpended balances—

Mr. CAPEHART. I am not certain that I do not agree. I think, in principle, it should all be left in or all should be taken out. I am wondering why the purchase of this machinery cannot be handled in some other way.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is a very serious question, to which I referred last Monday, when I read a list of some of the huge industrial concerns benefitting by this program and by the accelerated tax amortization program. I could not give their names, because they are classified, and it is proposed to turn over to them hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of equipment. In a great many instances they are also receiving accelerated tax amortizations in the amount of hundreds of millions of dollars. In view of that fact, I believe we should proceed a little carefully in the purchase of equipment, and I said that if this program is socialism my proposal is to have 10 percent less socialism.

Mr. CAPEHART. I would not even compromise on 10 percent, if that were the program. But is it not a fact that if we did not have amortization for tax purposes in connection with the \$9,000,000,000 about which the Senator has been speaking, Congress would have had to appropriate \$9,000,000,000 to produce the facilities?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am not going to argue the tax amortization program, because at the moment that is not germane. I do think that in granting tax-amortization on plants which had been started or planned before Korea for which the finances—

Mr. CAPEHART. But, proceeding on the theory that amortization for tax purposes has been honestly administered, my question is, Is it not a fact that if we did not have the \$9,000,000,000 under the tax amortization plan, the Congress of the United States would have had to appropriate an additional \$9,000,000,000?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I doubt that, myself.

Mr. CAPEHART. Why?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should prefer to address the discussion to the point at issue, which is whether we shall appropriate \$3,000,000,000 for the purchase of machinery and equipment which will then be used by private companies. I certainly do not know enough about it to say we should not purchase any equipment. I can understand the argument that some of the equipment will be so specialized that it will not have a

peacetime use, and, therefore, we shall have to help the companies in this way to produce the ships which are needed. Would it not be safer to go a little bit easy and take 10 percent off the Department of the Navy just as we have done in the case of the Army, particularly in view of the fact that there is for the Army nearly a \$1,000,000,000 unexpended balance carried over from appropriations made for fiscal 1951?

Mr. CAPEHART. I think the amount of \$61,000,000,000 is entirely too large. I do not think that much is needed. I do not think it could possibly be spent within the next 12 months. I do not know enough about the facts—and I question whether the able Senator from Illinois knows all the facts—to be qualified to say whether the amount should be \$3,000,000,000 or \$2,700,000,000. In my opinion, we are spending too much money. We spend and spend, we appropriate and appropriate. We have one emergency after another, and we give away with never a thought as to what the ultimate result to our country will be. We are spending entirely too much money. But I question whether a 10-percent reduction in this particular item is proper.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am merely offering a vehicle by which the Senator from Indiana may translate his general indignation about expenditures into specific economy.

Mr. CAPEHART. I stood on the floor of the Senate and voted against the \$7,200,000,000 give-away program a few days ago, and I noticed that the Senator from Illinois voted in favor of it. I vote against those sums that amount to something, whereas the Senator from Illinois indulges in small items which may well be all right. I have voted for 99 percent of them, and I shall continue to vote with the Senator; but when it comes to giving away money to other nations, I notice that the able Senator from Illinois always votes for it. I shall vote to recommit this bill. I think an appropriation of \$50,000,000,000 would be sufficient, and it would be just as nearly accurate as is \$61,000,000,000. I think we should spend in direct proportion to our ability to pay. The idea that we have the money is wrong; we do not have it. The national debt of the United States is \$256,000,000,000. The national debts of all our so-called allies in Europe amount to approximately \$115,000,000,000. Show me wherein we are better off than those nations, when we have a national debt of \$256,000,000,000, and they have a debt of \$115,000,000,000. In less than 2½ months we have run a deficit of four and one-half billion dollars. What are we thinking about? Where do we get this idea?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I welcome the support of the Senator from Indiana on my amendment.

Mr. CAPEHART. Where do we get the idea that we can afford to throw money all around the world, when we have a national debt of \$256,000,000,000?

What are they thinking about? Where are we going and what are we going to look like when we get there if

we continue the pace at which we are going? I know it is said that we have had various emergencies.

Mr. President, I wish I had before me the last report issued on the Marshall plan. I do not know how many times in that report the statement is made that the Marshall plan is being operated for the purpose of stopping communism. It is said that that is the purpose of the plan, and that the Marshall plan has resulted in stopping communism. I desire to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that when the Marshall plan was first suggested it was never the intention by that plan to stop communism. There was never a word mentioned about that. In fact, the Marshall plan when it was initiated was intended to take in all European countries, including Russia, and a Russian delegation attended the first Marshall plan conference in Paris, as did delegations from some of her satellites. The first report that was issued on the Marshall plan by Mr. Hoffman in 1949 did not say a word about stopping communism.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, may I ask if there is an amendment before the Senate?

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I have the floor. I object.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, who has the floor?

Mr. CAPEHART. I have the floor. The Senator from Illinois took his seat.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is of the opinion that the Senator from Illinois has the floor, and yielded to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, that could not possibly be true, because the able Senator from Illinois surrendered the floor and took his seat, and remained seated.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think the RECORD will show, Mr. President, that I yielded to the Senator from Indiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois yielded to the Senator from Indiana a few moments ago.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yielded to the Senator from Indiana, but not for an unlimited period. I would prefer to have the Senator speak on this matter, which seems to be extraneous to the amendment before the Senate, at some time other than in the midst of my own remarks.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I appreciate the fact that the Senator from Illinois does not like to hear such a speech as I am making. I know he does not like to hear it. But I want to say again that the purpose of the Marshall plan was never to stop communism. Russia was invited to participate in the Marshall plan. The delegates from Russia attended the first meeting on the Marshall plan held in Paris. In the first report issued by Mr. Hoffman there was not one word said about stopping communism.

Mr. President, the administration for years and years has lived on one emergency after another.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The amendment before the Senate now is an amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois to strike about \$11,000,000 from the appropriation in this bill for ships and facilities. It deals only with a single item in that appropriation. This appropriation is designed to support the maintenance and operation of the active fleet, and to bring some of the reserve fleet into existence. This appropriation includes the development of electronics. It includes cataloging and standardization. It includes research development. It includes maintenance and operation of shore facilities and of naval reserve vessels, industrial mobilization, fuel for ships, and departmental administration.

The subject to which the Senator has been directing his attention is that of industrial mobilization which is carried in the budget at \$29,000,000. The Senator's amendment would strike \$11,000,000 from that item, which is used for the purchase of machine tools. It would impair the operation which is now going on for keeping in trim the naval vessels which are now plying back and forth across the Atlantic Ocean. It does not deal with the Marshall plan or with any of the international affairs. This is an appropriation for the support of the American Navy, and I feel that the amendment which the Senator from Illinois has offered makes an altogether improper cut in the appropriation.

So, Mr. President, I hope that the amendment of the Senator from Illinois will be rejected. I may say after the vote upon this amendment is had, I shall suggest to the majority leader that the Senate recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon, when we may resume the consideration of these amendments. I did this politely to suggest to the Senator from Indiana that the discussion of these other aspects of the bill, of the policy which the Government is following, might well be postponed until that time.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I fully understand that the Marshall plan has nothing to do with this appropriation. But I want to say that we have a record here of spending and spending and spending. We have a record of appropriating and appropriating and appropriating. We have a record of having one emergency after the other. We have a record of going into the Marshall plan originally to rehabilitate the war-torn countries of Europe, and then when we get that job accomplished, we have an emergency and start on an entirely different line of selling the American people on the idea that we must put \$25,000,000,000 more over there for another purpose.

The only reason I rose was to ask a question. My question is: When are we going to come to our senses in this country and in this Congress? When are we going to realize that there is a limit to what the United States can do? When are we going to realize that we ourselves have a \$256,000,000,000 debt? When are we going to realize that the countries upon whom we are showering money have less than half as much debt as we have?

Oh yes, we hear the argument that our national income is much greater than theirs, and that our per capita wealth is much greater than theirs. I say to the Senate that that is a socialistic argument, in itself it is a communistic argument. When it is said that we have more than the other fellow, and therefore we have to divide up with him, that is a socialistic premise, a socialistic philosophy, which is used over and over and over again on the floor of the Senate in arguments in favor of doing this, that, and the other thing.

Mr. President, we kick the brains out of private industry in America which is supporting this program, and yet we appropriate and have appropriated billions upon billions of dollars to support a socialistic government in England.

We appropriate money to support a government in France, a government which is more than 50 percent composed of Socialists and Communists. We keep a socialistic government in power in England knowing full well that if socialism becomes stronger in England, knowing full well that if nationalization of all industry is adopted in England, some day we will be forced to do the same thing in the United States.

We recognized Russia in 1933, well knowing that if we helped to make communism a success in Russia, and it became successful, some day it would cause us trouble, and cause the whole world trouble. Yet, after three Presidents of the United States had refused to recognize Communist Russia, President Roosevelt recognized Communist Russia in 1933, and sent great teams of our experts over there to show the Russians how to develop mass production and build everything.

We are continuing along the same line here today. We are continuing to waste money, to squander money, to give money away, knowing that we have a \$256,000,000,000 debt, knowing that we are almost confiscating by taxation the income of our people in the United States. Yet, we go on and on without any end; we have war after war; we have emergency after emergency.

I feel very much discouraged. I say to Senators that they had better listen. If they are dissatisfied with what is going on in the United States, they had better take a good look at themselves in the mirror. The President of the United States has no power or authority which the Congress of the United States has not given to him. Senators may write letters back home as much as they please, and make as many speeches as they please, and blame the President for heavy taxation and large appropriations and unbalanced budgets; but it is the Congress of the United States which enacts the laws which gives him the authority. It is the Congress of the United States which appropriates the money which he is spending. It is the Congress of the United States which levies taxes. It is not the President of the United States. Some Senators think we are on our way to a dictatorship in the United States some of these days; I agree with them. But when they go home tonight, let them take a good look at themselves in the

mirror, because they are a part of the Congress of the United States which is giving the President of the United States the power and the authority to do all these things. Senators had better take a good look at themselves in the mirror and find out what is going on, because if this country goes bankrupt, as many people say it will, we cannot blame the President of the United States, because the Congress has control of the purse strings in America. We can put a stop to it any time we want to. We can cut this appropriation as much as we want to cut it.

I am not unmindful of the fact that communism is spreading throughout the world. It has spread throughout the world. We have not stopped it. There is more communism today than ever, and more people are under its domination today than there were 5 years ago.

We cannot buy good will with money. We seem to have the idea in Congress that we can solve all our own problems and all the problems of the world merely by appropriating more money. We seem to think that we can buy our way through the world with the dollar. I say that we cannot do it. If we could have bought good will with dollars, Russia ought to love us to death, and we ought to have the good will of Russia, because, God knows, we gave the Russians many billions of dollars in money and materials during World War II. We were their friends and supporters. We appropriated money which went directly to them. We bought materials and gave them to the Russians. Did it buy us any good will? It certainly did not.

Now we have another emergency. During World War II we had to stop Hitler. We had to stop nazism, so we teamed up with another cutthroat by the name of Stalin. We thought we could buy his good will with dollars, and we tried it. We were unable to do it. We gave India \$300,000,000 not long ago. We said we would buy India's good will, but we did not buy it. We do not have India's good will. India wants us to recognize the Chinese Communists. She refused to sign the Japanese peace treaty. We did not buy her good will. We cannot buy good will with money. We have been trying to do it for years, and it will not work.

Before I take my seat, let me repeat that we had better go home tonight and take a good look at ourselves in the mirror if we want to find out what is going on in the United States, and find out who is responsible for it. I repeat that the President of the United States has no power except that which is given to him by the Congress. He does not have a dollar to spend except that which is appropriated by the Congress.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. JENNER. The Senator is making a fine speech, but he is wasting his breath. He is not changing any votes. The press will not report what he is saying, and he might as well take his seat.

Mr. CAPEHART. I shall be very happy to do so.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. The Senator is perfectly correct when he speaks of limitations on the authority of the President. I wonder if the Senator has read the history of the Revolutionary War.

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not get the Senator's point.

Mr. KILGORE. I am asking whether or not the Senator from Indiana has studied the history of the Revolutionary War. During that period there was no executive authority, and the Congress endeavored to handle the financial aspects of the war without an executive department.

Mr. CAPEHART. I still do not get the point.

Mr. KILGORE. I am merely asking whether or not the Senator from Indiana has read the history of the Revolutionary War, which is published in any number of books.

Mr. CAPEHART. What has that to do with the appropriations before us today?

Mr. KILGORE. If the Congress usurps the power of the Executive, we shall place ourselves back in the situation we were in during the time of the Revolutionary War. I ask the Senator whether he has studied the history of the Revolutionary War, when the Congress endeavored to carry out the Executive authority.

Mr. CAPEHART. What I said was just the opposite. I said that the President of the United States has no authority except that which is given to him by the Congress.

Mr. KILGORE. I agree with the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. He has not a single dollar to spend except that which is appropriated by the Congress. My point is that it is our responsibility. We can put a stop to much of the monkey-business which is going on, and the waste, which I think will eventually bring bankruptcy to this Nation. We have a responsibility, and we ought to accept it.

The able junior Senator from Indiana has said that I am making no progress and changing no votes. I am inclined to agree with him, but I am making a record, so that when our children, our grandchildren, and our great-grandchildren read it, they will at least recognize the fact that there was one person who felt that the Congress of the United States ought to accept the responsibility for what is happening today.

Mr. KILGORE. I ask the Senator from Indiana if he wants the Congress to usurp the duties of the executive department.

Mr. CAPEHART. I cannot see anything in what I have said that has anything to do with taking power away from the President. What I said was that the President gets his authority through legislation enacted by the Congress. He gets the money to spend through appropriations made by the Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], which are being

considered en bloc as amendment designated "K."

The amendment was rejected.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MOODY in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Gus F. Geissler, of North Dakota, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation, vice Ralph S. Trigg, resigned.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Thomas B. Reed, and sundry other employees of the Coast and Geodetic Survey for permanent appointment, as commissioned captain, lieutenant (junior grade), and ensigns.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the nomination on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

DEFENSE MATERIALS PROCUREMENT ADMINISTRATION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Jess Larson to be Defense Materials Procurement Administrator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed, and without objection, the President will be immediately notified of the confirmation.

That completes the Executive Calendar.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McFARLAND. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, September 13, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate September 12 (legislative day of September 4), 1951:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Loy W. Henderson, of Colorado, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to India and Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Nepal, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Iran.

Chester Bowles, of Connecticut, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to India, and to serve concurrently and without additional

compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Nepal.

SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

Robert A. Lovett, of New York, to be Secretary of Defense.

DEPUTY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

William C. Foster, of New York, to be Deputy Secretary of Defense.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers of the Navy and Naval Reserve on active duty for temporary appointment to the grade of captain, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

For temporary appointment in the Navy:

Edward W. Abbot	James H. Fortune, Jr.
Noah Adair, Jr.	William C. Fortune
Harry A. Adams, Jr.	Everett J. Foster
Lionel A. Arthur	James G. Franklin
Frederick L. Ashworth	Edward H. Fredericks
Hugh R. Awtry	Charles T. Fritter
Harold R. Badger	Raymond L. Fulton
Christopher S. Barker	Raymond D. Fusselman
Stanley M. Barnes	Ignatius J. Galantin
Arthur J. Barrett, Jr.	Antone R. Gallaher
Porter F. Bedell	Norman W. Gambling
Lorentz D. Bellinger	Philip W. Garnett
Carter L. Bennett	Robert E. Garrels
Samuel Berpolet	Charles F. Garrison
James S. Béthea	Richard C. Gazlay
James V. Bewick	Robert M. Gibbons
Horace V. Bird	James B. Grady
John T. Blackburn	George D. Gregor
Arthur M. Blamphin	Edward E. Grimm
Francis J. Blouin	Murray Hanson
Harold G. Bowen, Jr.	Ward F. Hardman
Merle F. Bowman	Irvin S. Hartman
Theodore H. Brittan	Enrique D. Haskins
Frederick W. Bruning	Julian S. Hatcher, Jr.
Paul D. Buie	Luther C. Heinz
John D. Bulkeley	Blish C. Hills
Carl E. Bull	William S. Howell
Jesse B. Burks	George K. Hudson
James B. Burrow	Elgin B. Hurlbert
Robert S. Camera	Francis O. Iffrig
Clifford M. Campbell	Albert C. Ingels
Earnest G. Campbell	Walter D. Innis
James H. Campbell	Charles B. Jackson, Jr.
William J. Catlett, Jr.	Edward F. Jackson
Jay V. Chase	Raymond B. Jacoby
Benjamin B. Cheatham	Ellitt L. James, Jr.
Joseph O. Christian	Carlton B. Jones
Warren B. Christie	Jamie E. Jones
Thomas A. Christopher	John H. S. Johnson
Herbert G. Claudius	Stephen Jurika, Jr.
Merril K. Clementson	William R. Kane
James O. Cobb	John H. Kaufman
Garrett S. Coleman	Robert A. Keating, Jr.
Elmer H. Conklin	Clarence A. Keller, Jr.
Thomas F. Connolly	Richard L. Kibbe
Lester C. Conwell	Nova B. Kiergan, Jr.
Joseph P. Costello	Charles E. King
John L. Counihan, Jr.	George P. Koch
Gilbert L. Countryman	Joseph W. Koenig
John S. Coye, Jr.	Alexander Kusebauch
Harold F. Crist	George H. Laird, Jr.
Harold E. Cross	David Lambert
Robert W. Curtis	Richard Lane
Charles A. Curtze	Thomas D. Langen
Roy M. Davenport	Theodore S. Lank
Ray Davis	Charles O. Larson
Thomas M. Davis	Willard R. Laughon
William L. Dawson	Robert W. Leach
James B. Denny	John S. Lehman
Richard B. Derickson, Jr.	Philip P. Leigh
Irvin L. Dew	Hayden L. Leon
Frank A. Dingfelder	Porter Lewis
Bennett M. Dodson	Elmer C. Long
Charles K. Duncan	Charles E. Loughlin
James M. Elliott	Kenneth Loveland
Joseph F. Enright	Benjamin L. Lubeisky
Glover T. Ferguson	Michael J. Luokey
James D. Ferguson	William W. R. MacDonald
	Donald E. MacIntosh
	Robert A. Macpherson

Robert B. Madden
Robert E. Magoffin
John L. Maloney
Stevan Mandarich
Joseph I. Manning
Martin W. Mason
David L. Martineau
Paul Masterton
Dale Mayberry
Harry C. Maynard
Bernard H. Meyer
Clayton L. Miller
Edwin S. Miller
George H. Miller
Richard L. Mohan
George G. Molumphy
Henry S. Monroe
Charles L. Moore, Jr.
Thomas H. Moorer
Thomas H. Morton
Jesse H. Motes, Jr.
William C. Mott
David McCampbell
Henry H. McCarley
David H. McDonald
Hugh R. McKibbin
Dillon R. McMullen
Walter H. Newton, Jr.
Easton B. Noble

James R. Ogden
Robert I. Olsen
Samuel H. Pattie
Albert G. Pelling
Charles E. Perkins
Adolph J. Petersen
George L. Phillips
George E. Pierce
William V. Pratt II
Ralph M. Pray
George M. Price
William M. Rakow
James R. Reedy
Robert S. Riddell
William C. F. Robards
Charles E. Robertson
Jack W. Roe
George P. Rogers
George D. Roullard
Harold E. Ruble
Henry P. Rumble
Baxter L. Russell
William M. Ryon
Selby K. Santmyers
Arnold F. Schade
Frank D. Schwartz
Isador J. Schwartz
Frank G. Selby
Leland G. Shaffer

John Shannon
Edward E. Shelby
Martin A. Shellabarger
William R. Sheeley
Albert L. Shepherd
Wallace A. Sherrill
Ralph L. Shifley
Kenneth S. Shook
Frank M. Slater
Morgan Slayton
James A. Smith
John B. Smith
Norman E. Smith
Lewis L. Snider
Otto W. Spahr, Jr.
Robert H. Solfer
David A. Scoy
Paul L. Stahl
Reuben E. Stanley
Poyntell C. Staley, Jr.
John M. Steinbeck
Lemuel M. Stevens
Bernard M. Streat
John M. Stuart
Henry D. Sturr
Ralph E. Styles
William H. Sublette
Morton Sunderland
Rufus L. Taylor

Donald I. Thomas
Hubert E. Thomas
Edgar K. Thompson
Raymond W. Thompson, Jr.
Carl Tiedeman
Jack C. Titus
James F. Tucker
John A. Tyree, Jr.
George P. Unmacht
James J. Vaughan
Ruben E. Wagstaff
Thomas G. Wallace
Waldemar F. A. Wendt
Justin L. Wickens
Bruce E. Wiggin
Frederick H. Wahlig
James W. White
Chauncey S. Winard
Joseph W. Williams, Jr.
Francis E. Wilson
William R. Wilson
Philip W. Winston
William Winter, Jr.
Archie T. Wright, Jr.
Theodore R. Vogeley
Raymond P. Zimmerman

For temporary appointment in the Naval Reserve:

Allie R. Bosworth
Rosewell P. Bowles
Frank P. Brown
Irvan H. Cammaro
Denzel R. Carr
Stanley W. Carr
Chester J. Chastek
Arthur Enderlin
William P. Fetzner
Roy T. Gallemore
Harry C. Howe
Jack M. Howell
Joseph B. Hoyt, Jr.
William C. Hughes
Stephen E. Jones

George F. Kennedy
Joseph H. Kimpler
Glenn B. Lantz
David E. L. Lithgow
William N. Montgomery
Henry C. Nichols
Norris W. Potter, Jr.
Carl D. Short
William J. Strachan
William N. Van Denburgh
Quentell Violet
Marcus L. Whitford

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate September 12 (legislative day of September 4), 1951:

DEFENSE MATERIALS PROCUREMENT ADMINISTRATION

Jess Larson, of Oklahoma, to be Defense Materials Procurement Administrator.

82^d CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 5054

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SEPTEMBER 13, 1951

Ordered to be printed with the amendments of the Senate numbered

AN ACT

Making appropriations for the National Security Council, the National Security Resources Board, and for military functions administered by the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money
4 in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the National
5 Security Council, the National Security Resources Board,
6 and for military functions administered by the Department
7 of Defense, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending
8 June 30, 1952, namely:

TITLE I

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the National Security Council, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates not in excess of \$50 per diem for individuals; acceptance and utilization of voluntary and uncompensated services; and expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with work related to the activity of the Council; \$160,000.

NATIONAL SECURITY RESOURCES BOARD

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the National Security Resources Board; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates for individuals not in excess of \$50 per diem and contracts with temporary or part-time employees may be renewed annually; expenses of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the work of the National Security Resources Board; hire of passenger motor vehicles; reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services for protection of confidential files; not to exceed \$8,000 for newspapers and periodicals; and not to exceed \$10,000 for emergency and extraordinary expenses, to be expended under the direction of the Chairman

1 for such purposes as he deems proper, and his determination
 2 thereon shall be final and conclusive; \$1,600,000.

3 DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

4 MILITARY FUNCTIONS

5 TITLE II

6 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

7 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

8 For expenses necessary for the Office of the Secretary
 9 of Defense, the Armed Forces Policy Council, the Joint
 10 Chiefs of Staff and the Joint Staff, the Munitions Board, and
 11 the Research and Development Board, including purchase
 12 (not to exceed five for replacement only, including one at not
 13 to exceed \$4,500) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; and
 14 not to exceed \$60,000 for emergency and extraordinary ex-
 15 penses, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of
 16 Defense for such purposes as he deems proper, and his
 17 determination thereon shall be final and conclusive;
 18 **(1)**~~\$13,800,000~~ *\$14,450,000*.

19 CLAIMS

20 For payment of claims by the Office of the Secretary
 21 of Defense, the Army (except as provided in appropriations
 22 for civil functions administered by the Department of the
 23 Army), Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force, as authorized
 24 by law (5 U. S. C. 946; 28 U. S. C. 2672; 31 U. S. C.

1 222c, 222e, 223b, 223d, 224d; 34 U. S. C. 600; 35 U. S. C.
 2 91; 39 U. S. C. 135; 46 U. S. C. 797; Act of November
 3 15, 1945, 59 Stat. 582); claims (not to exceed \$1,000
 4 in any one case) for damages to or loss of private property
 5 incident to the operation of Army and Air National Guard
 6 camps of instruction, either during the stay of units of said
 7 organizations at such camps or while en route thereto or
 8 therefrom; claims, as authorized by law, for damage to
 9 property of railroads under training contracts; and repay-
 10 ment of amounts determined by the Secretary of the Army,
 11 the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air
 12 Force, or officers designated by them, to have been erro-
 13 neously collected from military and civilian personnel of the
 14 Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force or from
 15 States, Territories, or the District of Columbia, or members
 16 of National Guard units thereof; \$5,000,000.

17 RETIRED PAY

18 For retired pay and retirement pay, as authorized by law,
 19 of military personnel on the retired lists of the Army, Navy,
 20 Marine Corps, and the Air Force, including the reserve
 21 components thereof; and retainer pay for personnel of the in-
 22 active Fleet Reserve; \$345,000,000 (2): ~~Provided, That no~~
 23 ~~part of such sum shall be used to pay the retired or retire-~~
 24 ~~ment pay of any member of the Regular Army, Navy, Marine~~
 25 ~~Corps, or Air Force who is retired after the date of enact-~~

1 ment of this Act, unless such member was retired because
2 of ~~(1)~~ being unfit to perform the duties of his office, rank,
3 grade, or rating by reason of a physical disability incurred
4 in line of duty, or ~~(2)~~ achieving the age at which retirement
5 is required by law.

6 CONTINGENCIES

7 For emergencies and extraordinary expenses arising in
8 the Department of Defense, to be expended on the approval
9 or authority of the Secretary of Defense and such expenses
10 may be accounted for solely on his certificate that the ex-
11 penditures were necessary for confidential military purposes,
12 \$75,000,000: *Provided*, That a report of disbursements
13 under this item of appropriation shall be made quarterly
14 to the Appropriation Committees of the Congress.

15 EMERGENCY FUND

16 For transfer by the Secretary of Defense, with the ap-
17 proval of the Bureau of the Budget, to any appropriation
18 for military functions under the Department of Defense
19 available for research and development, to be merged with
20 and to be available for the same purposes. and for the same
21 time period, as the appropriation to which transferred,
22 \$90,000,000.

23 (3) NATIONAL EMERGENCY FUND

24 *For transfer by the Secretary of Defense for urgent*
25 *Military requirements, after consultation with the Joint Chiefs*

1 of Staff and with the approval of the President, to any
2 appropriation for military functions under the Department
3 of Defense, to be expended to expedite the procurement and
4 facility programs of the Department of Defense necessary
5 to provide for an expansion of air power and necessary
6 supporting forces for the United States Air Force and the
7 United States Navy to be merged with and to be available
8 for the same purposes, and for the same time period, as the
9 appropriation to which transferred, \$500,000,000 for ex-
10 penditure during fiscal year 1952 and thereafter during
11 1953 and \$4,500,000,000 for expenditure during fiscal
12 year 1953 for the purposes authorized in this paragraph:
13 Provided, That the limitation on the availability of any
14 appropriation to which transfers are made hereunder is
15 hereby increased by the amount of any such transfers: Pro-
16 vided further, That a report of transfers proposed under
17 this item shall be made to the Appropriations Committees and
18 the Armed Services Committees of the Congress ten days prior
19 to the actual transfer.

20 DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

21 TITLE III

22 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF THE ARMY

23 CONTINGENCIES OF THE ARMY

24 For emergencies and military expenses arising in
25 the Department of the Army or any of its subordinate

1 bureaus or offices in the District of Columbia, or in the
2 Army at large, but impossible to be anticipated or classified,
3 including personal services; the actual and necessary ex-
4 penses or per diem in lieu thereof, as may be determined
5 and approved by the Secretary of the Army, of military
6 and civilian personnel in and under the Department
7 of the Army on special duty in foreign countries;
8 to be expended on the approval or authority of
9 the Secretary of the Army, and for such purposes
10 as he may deem proper, and his determination thereon
11 shall be final and conclusive upon the accounting officers
12 of the Government and payments from this appropriation
13 may, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Army, be
14 made on his certificate that the expenditures were necessary
15 for confidential military purposes; \$88,000,000.

16 CIVILIAN RELIEF IN KOREA

17 For an additional amount for "Civilian relief in Korea,"
18 \$50,000,000.

19 EXPEDITING PRODUCTION

20 To enable the Secretary of the Army, without reference
21 to section 3734 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and to
22 section 1136 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (except
23 provisions thereof relating to title approval), to expedite
24 the production of equipment and supplies for the Army for
25 emergency national defense purposes, including all of the

1 objects and purposes specified under each of the appropria-
2 tions available to the Department of the Army during the
3 current fiscal year, for procurement or production of
4 equipment or supplies, for erection of structures, or for
5 acquisition of land; the furnishing of Government-owned
6 facilities at privately owned plants; the procurement and
7 training of civilian personnel in connection with the pro-
8 duction of equipment and material and the use and operation
9 thereof, \$1,000,000,000.

10 NATIONAL BOARD FOR PROMOTION OF RIFLE PRACTICE,
11 ARMY

12 For necessary expenses of construction, equipment, and
13 maintenance of rifle ranges, the instruction of citizens in
14 marksmanship, and promotion of rifle practice, in accord-
15 ance with the Act of August 29, 1916 (39 Stat. 643),
16 and the provisions of law contained in 10 U. S. C. 1184-
17 1185 and 32 U. S. C. 181-186, including travel of rifle
18 teams, military personnel and individuals attending regional,
19 national, and international competitions, and not to exceed
20 \$18,000 for incidental expenses of the National Board,
21 \$130,000: *Provided*, That travel expenses of civilian mem-
22 bers of the National Board shall be paid in accordance with
23 the Standardized Government Travel Regulations, as
24 amended.

GENERAL STAFF

FIELD EXERCISES

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, required for the conduct of special field exercises, including participation therein by the National Guard and the Organized Reserves, and including personal services of temporary employees, expenses of troop movements and temporary duty travel of military and civilian personnel, in connection with special field exercises, including special combat training for small units, movement of matériel, maintenance and operation of structures and utilities, rental of land or purchase of options to rent land without reference to section 3648, Revised Statutes, and for use or repair of private property, \$16,000,000.

INTER-AMERICAN RELATIONS, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary of the Army to adopt such measures, appropriate to the functions and activities of the Department of the Army, as he may deem advisable, to promote better relations with the other American countries, including transportation and subsistence expenses, while traveling in the Western Hemisphere, of Army officers and military students of the other American countries and Army officers of the United States, \$388,000.

FINANCE CORPS

FINANCE SERVICE, ARMY

3 For Finance Service, Army, to be accounted for as one
4 fund, as follows—

PAY OF THE ARMY

6 For pay and allowances (except commuted rations for
7 enlisted personnel) of cadets and all other personnel of the
8 Army of the United States on active duty (other than
9 personnel of the Reserve components, including the National
10 Guard, on active duty while undergoing Reserve training);
11 pay of civilian employees at military headquarters; interest
12 on soldiers' deposits; payment of life insurance premiums
13 authorized by law; mustering-out payments, as authorized by
14 the "Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944", as amended
15 (38 U. S. C. 691-691g), to persons who were or may be
16 denied such payments because they were discharged from
17 the Army to enter the United States Military Academy or
18 the United States Naval Academy and subsequently were
19 discharged from either Academy because of physical dis-
20 ability; expenses of military courts, boards and commissions;
21 expenses of apprehension and delivery of deserters, escaped
22 military prisoners, and soldiers absent without leave, in-
23 cluding payment of rewards, in the discretion of the Secre-
24 tary of the Army, not exceeding \$25 in any one case, to
25 civil officers and citizens, costs of confinement of military

1 prisoners in nonmilitary facilities, donations of not to exceed
2 \$25 to each civilian prisoner upon each release from an Army
3 prison and each soldier discharged otherwise than honorably
4 upon each release from confinement under court-martial sen-
5 tence, and donations of not to exceed \$10, as authorized by
6 law, to each person discharged for fraudulent enlistment;
7 \$3,297,076,000: *Provided*, That section 212 of the Act of
8 June 30, 1932 (5 U. S. C. 59a), shall not apply to retired
9 military personnel on duty at the United States Soldiers'
10 Home: *Provided further*, That the duties of librarian at the
11 United States Military Academy may be performed by an
12 officer of the Regular Army retired from active service, and de-
13 tailed on active duty for that purpose (4): *Provided further*,
14 *That all payments for accrued leave made to enlisted mem-*
15 *bers, discharged for the purpose of immediate reenlistment for*
16 *an indefinite period, at Fort Myer, Virginia, during the*
17 *period April 1, 1949, to September 30, 1949, both dates*
18 *inclusive, are hereby validated notwithstanding the provisions*
19 *of section 4 (c) of the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946, as*
20 *amended by the Act of August 4, 1947 (Public Law 350,*
21 *80th Congress):* *Provided further*, *That where such erro-*
22 *neous payments of accrued leave have been collected by, or*
23 *refunded to, the United States, reimbursement thereof shall*
24 *be effected by the General Accounting Office upon receipt of a*
25 *claim therefor from the said member or that person or persons*

1 *entitled to receive the arrears of pay of such member in ac-*
2 *cordance with the Act of June 30, 1906, as amended, 10*
3 *U. S. C. 868: Provided further, That the Comptroller Gen-*
4 *eral of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to*
5 *allow credit in the accounts of disbursing officers for any*
6 *payments validated hereby;*

7 TRAVEL OF THE ARMY

8 For travel allowances and travel in kind, as authorized
9 by law, for persons traveling in connection with the military
10 activities of the Department of the Army, including rental
11 of camp sites and the local procurement of communication
12 service, fuel, light, water service, and other necessary
13 supplies and services incident to individual or troop move-
14 ments, including transportation of organizational equipment
15 and impedimenta; and for expenses, not otherwise provided
16 for, incident to the transportation of authorized baggage of
17 military and civilian personnel; \$245,000,000: *Provided,*
18 *That other appropriations for the Department of the Army*
19 *shall be charged with such amounts as may be required for*
20 *travel in connection with development, procurement, produc-*
21 *tion, maintenance, or construction activities; and, with such*
22 *exception, no other Army appropriation in this Act shall be*
23 *available for any expense for or incident to travel of personnel*
24 *of the Regular Army or civilian employees under the Depart-*
25 *ment of the Army, except the appropriation "Contingencies*

1 of the Army” and the appropriations for Engineer Service,
 2 Army, the Army National Guard, the Organized Reserves,
 3 the Reserve Officers’ Training Corps, the National Board for
 4 the Promotion of Rifle Practice, and the appropriations
 5 “Special Field Exercises”, and “Inter-American Relations,
 6 Department of the Army”;

7 FINANCE SERVICE

8 For compensation of field personnel of the Finance
 9 Corps, and services incident to financial management activi-
 10 ties not otherwise provided for; payment of exchange fees
 11 and exchange losses incurred by disbursing officers or their
 12 agents; and losses in the accounts of Army disbursing officers
 13 in accordance with the Acts of December 13, 1944 (31
 14 U. S. C. 95a), December 23, 1944 (50 U. S. C. 1705-
 15 1707), and July 26, 1947 (61 Stat. 493) ; \$48,423,000.

16 QUARTERMASTER CORPS

17 QUARTERMASTER SERVICE, ARMY

18 For Quartermaster Service, Army, to be accounted for
 19 as one fund, as follows—

20 WELFARE OF ENLISTED MEN

21 For the equipment and conduct of school, reading, lunch,
 22 and amusement rooms, service clubs, chapels, gymnasiums,
 23 and libraries, including periodicals and other publications
 24 and subscriptions for newspapers, transportation of books
 25 and equipment for these services, rental of films, purchase

1 of slides for and making repairs to moving-picture outfits,
2 and for similar and other recreational purposes at training
3 and mobilization camps now established or which may be
4 hereafter established, including expenses for the entertain-
5 ment and instruction of enlisted personnel, \$20,000,000:
6 *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for the
7 instruction of officers on the same basis as enlisted men.

8 SUBSISTENCE OF THE ARMY

9 For purchase of subsistence supplies for issue as rations
10 to troops, including retired enlisted men when ordered to
11 active duty, civil employees when entitled thereto, hospital
12 matrons, applicants for enlistment while held under obser-
13 vation, general prisoners of war, and general prisoners at
14 posts; ice for issue to organizations of enlisted men and for
15 cooling drinking water and for preservation of stores; sub-
16 sistence of the masters, officers, crews, and employees of Army
17 vessels; meals for recruiting parties and applicants for enlist-
18 ment while under observation; sales to officers, including mem-
19 bers of the Officers' Reserve Corps while on active duty, and
20 enlisted men of the Army; payment of allowances of commu-
21 tation in lieu of rations to enlisted men as authorized by law;
22 commuted rations for enlisted men, applicants for enlistment
23 while held under observation, civilian employees who are
24 entitled to subsistence at public expense, and general

1 prisoners while sick in hospitals, to be paid to the surgeon in
2 charge; advertising; for subsistence of supernumeraries ne-
3 cessitated by emergent military circumstances; prizes to be
4 established by the Secretary of the Army for enlisted men
5 of the Army who graduate from the Army schools for bakers
6 and cooks; and for other necessary expenses incident to the
7 purchase, testing, care, preservation, issue, sale, and
8 accounting for subsistence supplies for the Army; in all,
9 \$603,309,000: *Provided*, That none of the funds appro-
10 priated in this title shall be used for the payment of
11 any subsidy on agricultural or other products: *Provided*
12 *further*, That no part of this or any other appropriation con-
13 tained in this Act shall be available for the procurement
14 of any article of food or clothing not grown or produced in
15 the United States or its possessions, except to the extent
16 that the Secretary of the Department concerned shall deter-
17 mine that a satisfactory quality and sufficient quantity of any
18 articles of food or clothing grown or produced in the United
19 States or its possessions cannot be procured as and when
20 needed at United States market prices and except procure-
21 ments by vessels in foreign waters and emergency procure-
22 ments or procurements of perishable foods by establishments
23 located outside the continental United States, except the
24 Territories of Hawaii and Alaska, for the personnel attached

1 thereto: *Provided further*, That nothing herein shall preclude
 2 the procurement of foods manufactured or processed in the
 3 United States or its possessions;

4 REGULAR SUPPLIES OF THE ARMY

5 For supplies, services, and other expenses, not otherwise
 6 provided for, incident to the design, development, procure-
 7 ment, manufacture, care, protection, alteration, repair, main-
 8 tenance, installation, storage and issue of Quartermaster
 9 Corps supplies, materials, and equipment (exclusive of fixed
 10 installations in buildings otherwise provided for), including
 11 petroleum and other products, market reports and personal
 12 services; supplies and equipment for troops and general serv-
 13 ice schools; operation of field printing plants not otherwise
 14 provided for and contract printing and binding; purchase,
 15 subsistence, and care of animals required in connection with
 16 Army training and other activities; expenses incident to
 17 raising and harvesting forage on military reservations, in-
 18 cluding, when specifically authorized by the Secretary of
 19 the Army, the cost of irrigation; \$465,000,000:

20 CLOTHING AND EQUIPAGE

21 For cloth, woolens, materials, and for the purchase and
 22 manufacture of clothing for the Army, including retired
 23 enlisted men when ordered to active duty, for issue and for
 24 sale; commutation of clothing due enlisted men; altering and

1 fitting clothing and washing and cleaning when necessary,
 2 including laundry work for enlisted men while patients in a
 3 hospital; operation of laundries, existing or now under con-
 4 struction, including purchase and repair of laundry machinery
 5 therefor; authorized issues of articles for use of general
 6 prisoners confined at military posts without pay or allow-
 7 ances, and for applicants for enlistment while held under
 8 observation; equipment and repair of equipment of existing
 9 dry-cleaning plants, salvage and sorting storehouses, hat-
 10 repairing shops, shoe-repair shops, clothing-repair shops,
 11 and garbage-reduction works; equipage; issue of toilet kits
 12 to recruits upon their first enlistment; expenses of packing
 13 and handling and similar necessities; citizens' outer clothing
 14 and an overcoat, when necessary, the cost of all not to
 15 exceed \$30, to be issued each person upon each release
 16 from an Army prison, each soldier discharged otherwise
 17 than honorably, to each enlisted man convicted by civil
 18 court for an offense resulting in confinement in a penitentiary
 19 or other civil prison, and to each enlisted man ordered
 20 interned as an alien enemy, or, for the same reason, dis-
 21 charged without internment; **(5)**\$1,506,681,000 \$1,639,-
 22 081,000 **(6)**: ~~Provided~~, That none of the funds appropriated
 23 in this or any other Act, and none of the property procured

1 therewith, shall be available for transfer to any working
 2 capital fund under the provisions of section 405 (d) of the
 3 National Security Act, as amended.

4 INCIDENTAL EXPENSES OF THE ARMY

5 Postage; incidental expenses of recruiting; for activi-
 6 ties of chaplains (excluding ritual garments and personal
 7 services); for tests and experimental and development
 8 work and scientific research, not otherwise provided for,
 9 including that to be performed by the Bureau of Standards
 10 for the Quartermaster Corps; for inspection service and
 11 instruction furnished by the Department of Agriculture
 12 which may be transferred in advance; for such additional
 13 expenditures as are necessary and authorized by law in the
 14 movements and operation of the Army and at military posts,
 15 and not expressly assigned to any other departments; for
 16 burial of the dead as authorized by Acts of May 17, 1938
 17 (10 U. S. C. 916-916d), and July 8, 1940 (5 U. S. C.
 18 103a), including remains of personnel of the Army of the
 19 United States who die while on active duty, including travel
 20 allowances of attendants accompanying remains, communi-
 21 cation service, transportation of remains, and acquisition by
 22 lease or otherwise of temporary burial sites; ~~(7)~~\$187,914,000
 23 \$194,514,000 ~~(8)~~: *Provided, That expenditures of appropri-*
 24 *ations contained in this Act for public informational activities*
 25 *of the Department of Defense shall not exceed \$10,950,000*

1 *including pay and allowances of military personnel assigned*
 2 *to such activities.*

3 TRANSPORTATION CORPS

4 TRANSPORTATION SERVICE, ARMY

5 For expenses necessary for the transportation of Army
 6 supplies, equipment, funds of the Army, including packing,
 7 crating, and unpacking; maintenance and operation of trans-
 8 portation facilities and installations, including the purchase,
 9 construction, alteration, operation, lease, repair, development,
 10 and maintenance of and research in transportation equipment,
 11 including boats, vessels, and railroad equipment; procure-
 12 ment of supplies and equipment; communication service;
 13 maps, wharfage, tolls, ferriage, drayage, and cartage;
 14 conducting instruction in Army transportation activities;
 15 ~~(9)\$968,515,000~~ \$938,515,000 (10) *for expenditure during*
 16 *fiscal year 1952 and thereafter during 1953 and \$30,000,-*
 17 *000 for expenditure during fiscal year 1953 for the purposes*
 18 *authorized in this paragraph: Provided, That during the*
 19 *current fiscal year the cost of transportation from point of*
 20 *origin to the first point of storage or consumption*
 21 *of supplies, equipment, and material in connection with the*
 22 *manufacturing and purchasing activities of the Quartermaster*
 23 *Corps may be charged to the appropriations from which*
 24 *such supplies, equipment, and material are procured: Pro-*
 25 *vided further, That vessels under the jurisdiction of the*

1 Department of Commerce, the Department of the Army,
2 the Department of the Air Force, or the Department of
3 the Navy may be transferred or otherwise made available
4 without reimbursement to any of such agencies upon the
5 request of the head of one agency and the approval of the
6 agency having jurisdiction of the vessels concerned.

7 SIGNAL CORPS

8 SIGNAL SERVICE OF THE ARMY

9 Purchase, equipment, operation, installation, and repair
10 of military telegraph, telephone, radio, cable, signaling, and
11 aircraft warning systems; signal equipment and stores,
12 heliographs, signal lanterns, flags, and other necessary in-
13 struments; wind vanes, barometers, anemometers, ther-
14 mometers, and other meteorological instruments; photo-
15 graphic and cinematographic work performed for the Army
16 by the Signal Corps; motor-driven and other vehicles for
17 technical and official purposes in connection with the con-
18 struction, operation, and maintenance of communication or
19 signaling systems, and supplies for their operation and main-
20 tenance; maps for use of the Signal Corps and in the office
21 of the Chief Signal Officer; telephone apparatus, including
22 rental and payment for commercial, exchange, message,
23 trunk-line, long-distance, and leased-line telephone service,
24 excepting telephone service for the various bureaus in the
25 District of Columbia, and the rental of commercial telegraph

1 lines and equipment, and their operation, at or connecting
2 any Army facility, including payment for official individual
3 telegraph messages transmitted over commercial lines; elec-
4 trical installations and maintenance thereof, electric time
5 service, fire control and direction apparatus, and matériel
6 for Field Artillery; supplies, general repairs, reserve
7 supplies, and other expenses connected with the col-
8 lection and transmitting of information for the Army
9 by telegraph or otherwise; experimental investigation,
10 research, purchase, and development, or improvements
11 in apparatus, and maintenance of signaling and acces-
12 sories thereto, including machines, instruments, and
13 other equipment for laboratory and repair purposes; lease,
14 alteration, and repair of such buildings required for storing
15 or guarding Signal Corps supplies, equipment, and personnel
16 when not otherwise provided for, including the introduction
17 of water, electric light and power, sewerage, grading, roads
18 and walks, and other equipment required; for all expenses,
19 not otherwise provided for, incident to the preparation of
20 plans, and construction, purchase, installation, equipment,
21 maintenance, repair, and operation of aircraft warning service
22 systems, and their accessories, including purchase of lands
23 and rights-of-way, acquisition of leaseholds and other interests
24 therein, and temporary use thereof; (11)\$1,243,707,000
25 \$817,931,000 (12)for expenditure during fiscal year 1952

1 *and thereafter during 1953 and \$400,000,000 for expendi-*
2 *tures during fiscal year 1953 for the purposes authorized in*
3 *this paragraph.*

4 ALASKA COMMUNICATION SYSTEM

5 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

6 For expenses necessary for the operation, maintenance,
7 and improvement of the Alaska Communication System, in-
8 cluding purchase (not to exceed one) and hire of passenger
9 motor vehicles, \$4,176,000, to remain available until the
10 close of the fiscal year 1953, and in addition not to exceed
11 15 per centum of the current fiscal year receipts of the
12 Alaska Communication System may be merged with and
13 used for the purposes of this appropriation.

14 CONSTRUCTION

15 For construction, installation, and equipment of tem-
16 porary or permanent public works, including buildings, facili-
17 ties, appurtenances and utilities, at stations of the Alaska
18 Communication System, as authorized by Act of October 27,
19 1949 (Public Law 414), without regard to sections 1136 and
20 3734, Revised Statutes, as amended, including hire of pas-
21 senger motor vehicles; \$1,400,000, to remain available
22 until expended: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall
23 not be available for construction of family quarters at (1)
24 an average cost in excess of \$24,000 for construction,
25 including but not limited to, kitchen range, refrigera-

1 tor, telephone, architectural and engineering services, and
2 all contingencies; nor at (2) a cost per family unit in excess
3 of \$5,000, for site development and outside utilities, including
4 architectural and engineering services therefor and all con-
5 tingencies.

6 MEDICAL SERVICE

7 MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL DEPARTMENT

8 For the manufacture and purchase of medical and hos-
9 pital supplies for military posts, camps, hospitals, hospital
10 ships and transports, and supplies required for mosquito
11 destruction in and about military posts in the Canal Zone;
12 operation of the Army Medical Library and Museum under
13 the direct supervision of the Surgeon General; purchase of
14 veterinary supplies and hire of veterinary surgeons; expenses
15 of medical supply depots and maintenance of branch depots;
16 medical care and treatment of patients when entitled thereto
17 by law, regulation, or contract, including their care, treat-
18 ment, and subsistence in private hospitals, whether on duty
19 or on furlough or on leave of absence except when elective
20 medical treatment has been obtained by such personnel in
21 civilian hospitals or from civilian physicians or dentists; medi-
22 cal care and treatment of authorized personnel of any country
23 whose defense the President deems vital to the defense of
24 the United States when such care and treatment cannot be
25 obtained from medical units of their own country; care and

1 treatment of epidemic and contagious diseases in the Army
 2 or at military posts or stations, including measures to prevent
 3 the spread thereof; pay of internes; pay of civilian physicians
 4 employed to examine physically applicants for enlistment
 5 and enlisted men and to render other professional services
 6 from time to time under proper authority; payment of ex-
 7 press companies and local transfers employed directly by the
 8 Medical Service for the transportation of medical and hos-
 9 pital supplies, including bidders' samples and water for
 10 analysis; supply of Army and Navy Hospital at Hot Springs,
 11 Arkansas; advertising, and other necessary miscellaneous
 12 expenses of the Medical Service, including tuition and fees
 13 of military and civilian personnel at civilian educational
 14 institutions; **(13)**~~\$269,580,000~~ \$259,580,000 **(14)***for ex-*
 15 *penditure during fiscal year 1952 and thereafter during*
 16 *1953 and \$10,000,000 for expenditure during fiscal year*
 17 *1953 for the purposes authorized in this paragraph.*

18 CORPS OF ENGINEERS

19 ENGINEER SERVICE, ARMY

20 For expenses necessary for the procurement, mana-
 21 facture, maintenance, and issue of utilities, engineer sup-
 22 plies, materials, and equipment; procurement, preparation,
 23 and reproduction of maps and similar data for military
 24 purposes; military surveys, engineering planning, and in-
 25 vestigation and design; expenses incident to military and

1 training operations, including operation of the Engineer
 2 School; travel and transportation; rentals, at the seat of
 3 Government or elsewhere, maintenance, installation, alter-
 4 ation, repair, protection, and operation of buildings, grounds,
 5 and other facilities, including appurtenances thereto; ad-
 6 ministration of real estate, acquisition of lands, easements,
 7 rights-of-way, or other similar interests in and tempo-
 8 rary use of lands, and, in administering the provisions
 9 of 43 U. S. C. 315q, rentals may be paid in advance;
 10 payment of deficiency judgments and interest thereon arising
 11 out of condemnation proceedings; relocation of utilities not
 12 otherwise provided for; utility services for buildings erected
 13 at private cost, as authorized by law (10 U. S. C. 1346),
 14 and buildings on military reservations authorized by Depart-
 15 ment of the Army regulations to be used for a similar pur-
 16 pose; and expenses of packing, crating, unpacking, and
 17 uncrating of supplies, materials, equipment, and baggage
 18 not otherwise provided for; ~~(15)\$1,166,049,000 \$1,126,-~~
 19 ~~049,000~~ *(16)for expenditure during fiscal year 1952 and*
 20 *thereafter during 1953 and \$40,000,000 for expenditure*
 21 *during fiscal year 1953 for the purposes authorized in this*
 22 *paragraph.*

23 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY

24 For an additional amount for "Military construction,

1 Army," to remain available until expended, \$48,363,700,
 2 for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority
 3 heretofore granted under this head to enter into contracts.

4 ORDNANCE CORPS

5 ORDNANCE SERVICE AND SUPPLIES, ARMY

6 For manufacture, procurement, storage, and issue, in-
 7 cluding research, planning, design, development, inspection,
 8 test, alteration, maintenance, repair, and handling of ordnance
 9 material and aircraft, together with the machinery, supplies,
 10 and services necessary thereto; supplies and services in con-
 11 nection with the general work of the Ordnance Corps, com-
 12 prising police and office duties, rents, tolls, fuel, light, water,
 13 advertising, stationery, typewriting and computing machines,
 14 including their exchange, and furniture, tools, and instru-
 15 ments of service; instruction, training, and other incidental
 16 expenses of the ordnance service; purchase and hire of
 17 passenger motor vehicles; ammunition for military salutes
 18 at Government establishments and institutions to which the
 19 issues of arms for salutes are authorized; services, material,
 20 tools, and appliances for operation of the testing machines
 21 and chemical laboratory in connection therewith; publi-
 22 cations for libraries of the Ordnance Corps, including
 23 the Ordnance Office; (17) ~~\$8,307,500,000~~ \$3,332,082,430
 24 (18) *for expenditure during fiscal year 1952 and thereafter*
 25 *during 1953 and \$4,743,974,000 for expenditure during*

1 *fiscal year 1953 for the purposes authorized in this*
2 *paragraph.*

3 CHEMICAL CORPS

4 CHEMICAL SERVICE, ARMY

5 For purchase, manufacture, and test of chemical agents
6 and toxic substances, incendiary materials and munitions,
7 gas masks, or other offensive or defensive materials or appli-
8 ances required for chemical purposes, investigations, research,
9 design, experimentation, and operation, purchase of chemi-
10 cals, special scientific and technical apparatus and instru-
11 ments, including services connected therewith; maintenance
12 and repair of plants, buildings, and equipment, and the
13 machinery therefor; receiving, storing, and issuing of sup-
14 plies, comprising police and office duties, rents, tolls, fuels,
15 gasoline, lubricants, paints and oils, rope and cordage, light,
16 water, advertising, stationery, typewriting and computing
17 machines including their exchange, office furniture, tools, and
18 instruments; incidental expenses; libraries of the Chemical
19 Corps; expenses incidental to the organization, training, and
20 equipment of special gas troops not otherwise provided for,
21 including the training of the Army in Chemical Corps activi-
22 ties, both offensive and defensive, together with the necessary
23 schools, tactical demonstrations, and maneuvers; expenses
24 of chemical projectile filling plants and proving grounds, in-
25 cluding maintenance of rail transportation, repairs, altera-

1 tions, accessories, building and repairing butts and targets,
 2 clearing and grading ranges; (19) ~~\$122,560,000~~ \$102,560,-
 3 000 (20) *for expenditure during fiscal year 1952 and there-*
 4 *after during 1953 and \$20,000,000 for expenditure during*
 5 *fiscal year 1953 for the purposes authorized in this paragraph.*

6 ARMY TRAINING

7 For miscellaneous supplies, material, equipment, and
 8 services, tuition and other incidental expenses, not
 9 otherwise provided for, essential in conducting instruc-
 10 tion in service schools and elsewhere; contingencies
 11 for the Commandant of the National War College, to be
 12 expended in his discretion (not exceeding \$1,000); pur-
 13 chase, repair, and cleaning of uniforms for guards at the
 14 National War College; operation of the Office, Chief, Army
 15 Field Forces, subordinate commands, installations, and
 16 boards, not otherwise provided for, \$22,300,000.

17 UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

18 MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION

19 For text and reference books for instruction; increase
 20 and expense of library; office equipment and supplies; sta-
 21 tionery, blank books, forms, diplomas for graduates;
 22 expense of lectures; apparatus, equipment, supplies, and
 23 materials for purpose of instruction and athletics, and
 24 maintenance and repair thereof; musical instruments and

1 maintenance of band; care and maintenance of organ;
2 equipment for cadet mess; postage, telephones, and tele-
3 grams; freight and expressage; for commutation of rations
4 to the cadet mess for civilians employed and subsisted at
5 cadet mess in the same amount as deducted from each civil-
6 ian's pay for said rations; expenses, including not to exceed
7 \$95,000 for contingencies, incident to the observance of the
8 Sesquicentennial of the Military Academy; contingencies for
9 Superintendent of the Military Academy (not exceeding
10 \$5,200) and for the Commandant of Cadets (not exceeding
11 \$1,200), to be expended in their respective discretions;
12 expenses of the members of the Board of Visitors (not ex-
13 ceeding \$1,500); contingent fund, to be expended under the
14 direction of the Academic Board (not exceeding \$1,000);
15 improvement, repair, and maintenance of buildings and
16 grounds (including roads, walls, and fences); shooting gal-
17 leries and ranges; cooking, heating, and lighting apparatus
18 and fixtures and operation and maintenance thereof; mainte-
19 nance of water, sewer, and plumbing systems; maintenance of
20 and repairs to cadet camp; fire-extinguishing apparatus; ma-
21 chinery and tools and repairs of same; policing buildings and
22 grounds; furniture, refrigerators, and lockers for Government-
23 owned buildings at the Academy and repair and maintenance
24 thereof; fuel for heat, light, and power; and other necessary

1 incidental expenses in the discretion of the superintendent;
2 in all, \$6,305,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$3,750 of
3 this amount shall be available to liquidate the indebtedness
4 of cadets separated from the service for any reason during
5 their first year, who at the time of their separation are in
6 debt to the Treasurer of the United States Military Academy.

7 CIVILIAN COMPONENTS

8 ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

9 For expenses necessary for equipping, maintaining, op-
10 erating and training the Army National Guard, including
11 expenses of camps, airfields, storage facilities, buildings,
12 structures, rifle ranges, and facilities, the purchase (not
13 to exceed one hundred) and hire of passenger motor vehicles
14 for official use only, and the modification, repair, maintenance
15 and operation of airplanes; transportation of things; personal
16 services in the National Guard Bureau and services of per-
17 sonnel of the Army National Guard employed as civilians
18 (without regard to their military rank) necessary for the
19 care, maintenance, modification and repair of materials and
20 equipment, for Federal property and custodial accounting
21 work, and for administrative and such other duties as may
22 be required; medical and hospital treatment of members
23 of the Army National Guard who suffer injury or con-
24 tract disease in line of duty and other expenses connected
25 therewith as authorized by law; pay at a rate not less than

1 \$2,400 per annum and travel of property and disbursing offi-
2 cers for the United States; travel expenses (other than mile-
3 age), at the same rates as authorized by law for Army
4 National Guard personnel on active Federal duty, of Army
5 National Guard division and regimental commanders while
6 inspecting units in compliance with National Guard regula-
7 tions when specifically authorized by the Chief, National
8 Guard Bureau; attendance of Army National Guard per-
9 sonnel at military service schools; drill pay of the Army
10 National Guard; subsistence for drills of eight or more hours
11 duration in any one calendar day; expenses of temporary
12 duty travel of personnel of the Regular Army in connection
13 with activities of the Army National Guard; procurement
14 and issue to the Army National Guard of the several States,
15 Territories, and the District of Columbia of military equip-
16 ment and supplies, as provided by law, including motor-
17 propelled vehicles and airplanes; and expenses of repair,
18 modification, issue, maintenance and use of supplies, material
19 and equipment, and such property may be furnished from
20 Army stocks without reimbursement subject to recall for
21 Army requirements; \$202,982,000, to remain available
22 until June 30, 1953: *Provided*, That the number of care-
23 takers authorized to be employed for any one unit or pool
24 under the provisions of section 90 of the National Defense

1 Act of June 3, 1916, as amended, may be such as is deemed
2 necessary by the Secretary of the Army.

3 ORGANIZED RESERVES

4 For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, and trans-
5 portation (including mileage, actual and necessary expenses,
6 or per diem in lieu thereof), and medical and hospital
7 treatment and related expenses, as authorized by law, for
8 personnel of the Organized Reserve Corps while on active
9 duty undergoing Reserve training or while performing drills
10 or equivalent duty; maintenance, operation, rental, repair,
11 and other necessary expenses of facilities for the training
12 and administration of the Organized Reserve Corps; ex-
13 penses of temporary-duty travel in connection with activities
14 of the Organized Reserve Corps; transportation of things;
15 purchase (not to exceed two hundred) and hire of passenger
16 motor vehicles and aircraft; supplies, services, matériel, and
17 equipment, not otherwise provided for, necessary to train and
18 equip the Organized Reserve Corps; and expenses of modifi-
19 cation, issue, maintenance, and use of supplies, matériel, and
20 equipment, which may be furnished without reimbursement
21 from Army stock; \$104,810,000 to remain available until
22 June 30, 1953.

23 ARMY RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS

24 For expenses necessary for the operation of the Reserve
25 Officers' Training Corps, as authorized by law, including

1 procurement, maintenance, transportation, and issue of sup-
2 plies and equipment; pay, subsistence, allowances, trans-
3 portation (including mileage), and medical and hospital
4 treatment and related expenses for members of the Reserve
5 Officers' Training Corps as authorized by law; hire of
6 passenger motor vehicles; maintenance and operation of
7 facilities; establishment and maintenance of camps; cleaning
8 and laundering of uniforms and clothing at camps; expenses
9 of temporary duty travel in connection with activities of
10 the Reserve Officers' Training Corps; expenses for institu-
11 tions as authorized by section 1225, Revised Statutes, as
12 amended, and section 55c of the National Defense Act, as
13 amended (34 U. S. C. 1129; 10 U. S. C. 1180, 1181) :
14 expenses of modification, issue, maintenance, and use of
15 supplies, materials, and equipment, which may be furnished
16 without reimbursement from Army stocks; to remain avail-
17 able until June 30, 1953, \$27,141,000.

18 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY CIVILIAN COMPONENTS

19 For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation
20 and conversion of facilities for the training and administration
21 of the reserve components, including contributions therefor,
22 as authorized by the Act of September 11, 1950 (64 Stat.
23 829), without regard to sections 1136 and 3734, Revised
24 Statutes, as amended, and land and interests therein may be

1 acquired and construction prosecuted thereon prior to the
 2 approval of title by the Attorney General as required by
 3 section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; hire of
 4 passenger motor vehicles; \$24,000,000, to remain available
 5 until expended.

6 DEPARTMENTAL SALARIES AND EXPENSES

7 SALARIES, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

8 For compensation for personal services in the Depart-
 9 ment of the Army proper, to be accounted for as one fund,
 10 as follows:

11 Office of Secretary of the Army: Secretary of the
 12 Army, Under Secretary of the Army, Assistant Secretaries
 13 of the Army, and other personal services, ~~(21)\$3,625,000~~
 14 \$3,723,400.

15 Office of Chief of Staff, \$9,500,000;

16 Adjutant General's Office, \$16,500,000;

17 Office of the Inspector General, \$259,000;

18 Office of the Judge Advocate General, ~~(22)\$700,000~~
 19 \$743,000;

20 Office of the Chief of Finance, \$1,540,500;

21 Office of the Quartermaster General, ~~(23)\$9,625,000~~
 22 \$9,875,000;

23 Office of the Chief of Transportation, ~~(24)\$3,800,000~~
 24 \$4,024,000;

25 Office of the Chief Signal Officer, \$3,750,000;

Office of the Provost Marshal General, \$245,000;

Office of the Surgeon General, \$3,100,000;

Office of Chief of Engineers, \$5,400,000;

Office of Chief of Ordnance, ~~(25)\$6,500,000~~ \$6,750,-
000;

Office of Chief, Chemical Corps, \$1,500,000;

Office of Chief of Chaplains, \$170,000.

(26) *Total expenditures of funds appropriated by this para-
graph shall be limited to 95 per centum of the total amount
appropriated by this paragraph.*

CONTINGENT EXPENSES, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

For miscellaneous expenses at the seat of government,
\$30,000,000.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

TITLE IV

MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY

For pay, allowances, subsistence, interest on deposits,
gratuities, clothing, permanent change of station travel (in-
cluding expenses of temporary duty between permanent duty
stations), and transportation of dependents, as authorized
by law, for regular and reserve personnel on active duty
(except those on active duty while undergoing reserve
training), \$2,456,475,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVAL RESERVE

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities,

1 and travel, as authorized by law, for personnel of the Naval
2 Reserve on active duty while undergoing reserve training,
3 or while performing drills or equivalent duty \$62,718,000.

4 **MILITARY PERSONNEL, OFFICER CANDIDATES**

5 For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, and
6 travel, as authorized by law, for officer candidates,
7 including midshipmen at the Naval Academy, aviation
8 midshipmen, aviation cadets, regular and contract enrollees
9 in the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and Reserve
10 officer candidates; and retainer pay authorized by the Act of
11 August 13, 1946 (34 U. S. C. 1020h), to remain available
12 until June 30, 1953; \$19,348,000.

13 **NAVY PERSONNEL, GENERAL EXPENSES**

14 For expenses necessary for general training, education
15 and administration of regular and reserve personnel, includ-
16 ing tuition, cash book allowances of not to exceed \$50 for
17 each Naval Aviation College program student, and other
18 costs incurred at civilian schools, general training aids and
19 devices, procurement of military personnel, and authorized
20 annuity premiums and retirement benefits for civilian mem-
21 bers of teaching staffs; maintenance and operation of Navy
22 training and personnel facilities, including the Naval Acad-
23 emy, Naval Postgraduate School, Naval War College, Naval
24 Home, Navy training schools and facilities, disciplinary
25 barracks, and retraining commands; rent; hire of motor

1 vehicles; not to exceed \$30 per person for civilian clothing,
2 including an overcoat when necessary, for enlisted person-
3 nel discharged otherwise than honorably; welfare and recre-
4 ation; medals and other awards; research and development;
5 and departmental salaries; \$97,570,000.

6 **MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS**

7 For pay, allowances, subsistence, interest on deposits,
8 gratuities, clothing, permanent change of station travel (in-
9 cluding expenses of temporary duty between permanent
10 duty stations), and transportation of dependents, as author-
11 ized by law, for regular and reserve personnel on active duty
12 (except those on active duty while undergoing reserve
13 training), \$565,459,000.

14 **MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS RESERVE**

15 For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities,
16 and travel, as authorized by law, for personnel of the Marine
17 Corps Reserve and the Marine Corps platoon leaders class
18 on active duty while undergoing reserve training, or while
19 performing drills or equivalent duty, \$15,145,000.

20 **MARINE CORPS TROOPS AND FACILITIES**

21 For necessary expenses of troops and facilities of the
22 Marine Corps not otherwise provided for, including mainte-
23 nance and operation of equipment and facilities, and pro-
24 curement of military personnel; training and education of
25 regular and reserve personnel, including tuition and other

1 costs incurred at civilian schools; welfare and recreation;
2 not to exceed \$30 per person for civilian clothing, including
3 an overcoat when necessary, for enlisted personnel dis-
4 charged otherwise than honorably; research and develop-
5 ment; procurement and manufacture of ordnance, ammuni-
6 tion, and other military supplies, equipment and clothing;
7 purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles; transporta-
8 tion of things; industrial mobilization; rent; medals, awards,
9 emblems and other insignia; care of the dead; and depart-
10 mental salaries; \$1,018,120,000.

11 AIRCRAFT AND FACILITIES

12 For expenses necessary for maintenance, operation, and
13 modification of aircraft; maintenance, operation, and lease
14 of air stations and facilities, testing laboratories, fleet and
15 other aviation activities; procurement of services, supplies,
16 special clothing, tools, materials, and equipment, including
17 rescue boats; research and development; industrial mobiliza-
18 tion; aerological services, supplies, and equipment for the
19 Navy and Marine Corps; and departmental salaries; \$923,-
20 393,000: *Provided*, That the unexpended balance of the
21 appropriation for "Aviation, Navy, 1949" shall remain
22 available until June 30, 1952, for the liquidation of con-
23 tract obligations incurred thereunder during the fiscal year
24 1949 for aircraft equipment and research and development.

1 CONSTRUCTION OF AIRCRAFT AND RELATED

2 PROCUREMENT

3 For construction, procurement, and modernization of
4 aircraft and equipment, including ordnance, spare parts, and
5 accessories therefor; expansion of public and not to ex-
6 ceed \$100,000,000 for expansion of private plants, includ-
7 ing the land necessary therefor, without regard to section
8 3734, Revised Statutes, as amended, and such land, and
9 interests therein, may be acquired and construction pros-
10 ecuted thereon prior to approval of title by the Attorney
11 General as required by section 355, Revised Statutes, as
12 amended; procurement and installation of equipment in public
13 or private plants; and departmental salaries necessary for
14 the purposes of this appropriation, to remain available until
15 expended, ~~(27)\$4,000,000,000~~ \$1,050,000,000 ~~(28)~~for
16 expenditure during fiscal year 1952 and thereafter and
17 \$2,950,000,000 for expenditure during fiscal year 1953 and
18 thereafter for the purposes authorized in this paragraph, of
19 which \$450,000,000 ~~(29)~~of the \$1,050,000,000 is for
20 liquidation of obligations incurred under authority heretofore
21 granted to enter into contracts for the foregoing purposes.

22 SHIPS AND FACILITIES

23 For expenses necessary for design, maintenance, opera-
24 tion, and alteration of vessels; maintenance and operation of

1 facilities; procurement of plant equipment, appliances, and
 2 machine tools, and installation thereof in public or private
 3 plants; procurement of equipment, supplies, special clothing
 4 and services, including subsistence and other expenses of
 5 civilian crews of vessels; installation, maintenance, and re-
 6 moval of ships' ordnance; lease of facilities and docks;
 7 charter and hire of vessels; relief of vessels in distress; mari-
 8 time salvage services; research and development; industrial
 9 mobilization; and departmental salaries; \$1,537,452,000.

10 CONSTRUCTION OF SHIPS

11 For an additional amount for "Construction of Ships,"
 12 to remain available until expended, \$77,353,000, of which
 13 \$55,961,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred pur-
 14 suant to authority heretofore granted under this head:
 15 *Provided*, That the total of obligations incurred under this
 16 head for construction, conversion, or replacement, approved
 17 after July 17, 1947, shall not exceed \$1,085,663,000.

18 SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION

19 For expenses necessary for the construction, acquisition,
 20 or conversion of vessels as authorized by the Act of March
 21 10, 1951 (Public Law 3), or otherwise authorized by law,
 22 including plant equipment, appliances, and machine tools,
 23 and installation thereof in public or private plants, and de-
 24 partmental salaries necessary for the purposes of this appro-
 25 priation, ~~(30)\$1,343,297,000~~ \$245,040,000 (31)for ex-

1 *penditure during fiscal year 1952 and thereafter and \$1,098,-*
2 *257,000 for expenditure during fiscal year 1953 and there-*
3 *after for the purposes authorized in this paragraph, to remain*
4 *available until expended: Provided, That the amount hereto-*
5 *fore appropriated under the head "Construction of ships" for*
6 *the purposes of the Act of March 10, 1951, is hereby trans-*
7 *ferred to and merged with this appropriation: Provided fur-*
8 *ther, That the total of obligations incurred for the foregoing*
9 *purposes shall not exceed \$1,480,297,000.*

10 ORDNANCE AND FACILITIES

11 For expenses necessary for the production and procure-
12 ment of Navy ordnance and ammunition (except ordnance
13 for new aircraft, new ships, and ships authorized for con-
14 version) ; alteration, preservation, and handling of ordnance
15 and ammunition; maintenance of ordnance (except installa-
16 tion, maintenance, and removal of ships' ordnance, and line
17 maintenance of ordnance installed in aircraft) ; maintenance
18 and operation of ordnance facilities; procurement of equip-
19 ment, supplies, special clothing and services; procurement of
20 plant equipment, appliances, and machine tools, and installa-
21 tion thereof in naval or private plants; lease of facilities;
22 research and development; industrial mobilization; and de-
23 partmental salaries; \$1,335,668,000.

1 ORDNANCE FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION

2 For an additional amount for "Ordnance for new con-
3 struction," to remain available until expended, \$52,445,000,
4 for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority
5 heretofore granted under this head.

6 ORDNANCE FOR SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION

7 For expenses necessary for the construction and pro-
8 curement of armor and armament for vessels provided for in
9 plant equipment, appliances, and machine tools, and instal-
10 lation thereof in public or private plants, and departmental
11 salaries necessary for the purposes of this appropriation,
12 ~~(\$32)\$431,390,000~~ *\$75,000,000 (\$33)for expenditure during*
13 *fiscal year 1952 and thereafter and \$356,390,000 for ex-*
14 *penditure during fiscal year 1953 and thereafter for the*
15 *purposes authorized in this paragraph, to remain available*
16 *until expended: Provided, That the total of obligations*
17 *incurred under this head shall not exceed \$431,390,000.*

18 INCREASE AND REPLACEMENT OF NAVAL VESSELS

19 CONSTRUCTION AND MACHINERY

20 For an additional amount for "Construction and
21 machinery", including, during the current fiscal year, per-
22 sonal services in the Bureau of Ships necessary for the pur-
23 poses of this appropriation, \$45,000,000.

ARMOR, ARMAMENT, AND AMMUNITION

For an additional amount for "Armor, armament, and ammunition," including, during the current fiscal year, personal services in the Bureau of Ordnance necessary for the purposes of this appropriation, \$12,656,000.

MEDICAL CARE

For expenses necessary for maintenance and operation of naval hospitals, medical centers, clinics, schools, research facilities, the medical supply system, and other medical activities; procurement of ambulances, medical and dental supplies, equipment and services; rent; instruction of medical personnel in naval hospitals, naval medical schools, and civilian schools; research and development; industrial mobilization; care of the dead; and departmental salaries; \$135,770,000.

CIVIL ENGINEERING

For expenses necessary for maintenance and operation of district public works offices, public works centers, advance base depots, construction battalion centers, defense housing projects, other civil engineering facilities, and shore activities not otherwise provided for; procurement of services, supplies and equipment for the foregoing activities; purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles; research and development;

1 engineering services; industrial mobilization; and depart-
2 mental salaries; \$196,488,000.

3 PUBLIC WORKS

4 For an additional amount for "Public works", to remain
5 available until expended, ~~(34)\$50,414,000~~ \$51,657,000,
6 ~~(35)~~of which \$1,243,000 shall be used for construction,
7 installation, or repair of sewage facilities at the naval base,
8 Newport, Rhode Island, and the remainder shall be available
9 for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority
10 heretofore granted under this head to enter into contracts.

11 FACILITIES

12 For expenses necessary for acquisition, construction, and
13 installation of production facilities and equipment, and test
14 facilities and equipment (other than those for research and
15 development), including the land necessary therefor, with-
16 out regard to section 3734, Revised Statutes, as amended,
17 and such land, and interests therein, may be acquired and
18 construction prosecuted thereon prior to the approval of title
19 by the Attorney General as required by section 355, Revised
20 Statutes, as amended, such amounts as may be determined by
21 the Secretary of the Navy, and approved by the Secretary of
22 Defense and the Bureau of the Budget, and said amounts
23 shall be derived by transfer from any appropriations avail-
24 able to the Department of the Navy, during the fiscal year
25 1952, for procurement of equipment for installation or use

1 in private plants: *Provided*, That the total amount so trans-
2 ferred shall not exceed \$100,000,000.

3 RESEARCH

4 For conduct and encouragement of research and develop-
5 ment, not otherwise provided for; dissemination of scientific
6 information; administration of patents, trade-marks, and
7 copyrights; maintenance and operation of research and de-
8 velopment facilities; development, installation, and main-
9 tenance of special devices (including specialized housing
10 therefor) ; procurement of supplies, services, and equipment;
11 departmental salaries; and other expenses necessary in carry-
12 ing out the Act of August 1, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 475), to
13 remain available until expended, \$69,698,000.

14 SERVICE-WIDE SUPPLY AND FINANCE

15 For expenses necessary for maintenance and operation
16 of service-wide supply and finance activities, including supply
17 depots and centers, clothing depots, market and purchasing
18 offices, supply demand control points, fleet fueling facilities,
19 overseas air cargo terminals, regional accounting and dis-
20 bursing offices, the material catalog office, the cost inspection
21 service, and other service-wide supply and finance facilities,
22 as designated by the Secretary; procurement of supplies,
23 services, special clothing, and equipment; rent; intra-Navy
24 transportation of things, all transportation of Navy stock
25 fund material, and transportation of household effects; re-

1 search and development; industrial mobilization; losses in
2 exchange and in the accounts of disbursing officers, as au-
3 thorized by law; and departmental salaries; \$485,102,000.

4 NAVY STOCK FUND

5 For additional working capital for the Navy stock fund,
6 established pursuant to the National Security Act Amend-
7 ments of 1949, \$450,000,000.

8 SERVICE-WIDE OPERATIONS

9 For expenses necessary for maintenance and operation
10 of the Naval Observatory, the Hydrographic Office, Service-
11 wide Communications, Naval Records Centers, Naval Dis-
12 trict Headquarters (except training and public works
13 offices), River Commands, and other service-wide operations
14 and functions not otherwise provided for; procurement of
15 supplies, services and equipment for activities financed
16 hereunder; Latin-American cooperation; not to exceed
17 \$42,127,000 for emergencies and extraordinary expenses,
18 as authorized by section 6 of the Act of August 2, 1946
19 (5 U. S. C. 419c), to be expended on the approval and
20 authority of the Secretary, and his determination shall be
21 final and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the
22 Government; and departmental salaries; \$150,779,000.

1 OPERATION AND CONSERVATION OF NAVAL PETROLEUM

2 RESERVES

3 For expenses necessary for exploration, prospecting, con-
4 servation, development, use, and operation of the naval
5 petroleum reserves, as authorized by law, \$11,908,000.

6 DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

7 TITLE V

8 AIRCRAFT AND RELATED PROCUREMENT

9 For construction, procurement, and modification of air-
10 craft and equipment, armor and armament, spare parts and
11 accessories therefor; specialized equipment; expansion of
12 public and private plants, Government-owned equipment
13 and installation thereof in such plants, erection of structures,
14 and acquisition of land without regard to section 1136, Re-
15 vised Statutes, as amended, for the foregoing and other pur-
16 poses, and such land, and interests therein, may be acquired
17 and construction prosecuted thereon prior to the approval
18 of title by the Attorney General as required by section
19 355, Revised Statutes, as amended; industrial mobilization,
20 including maintenance of reserve plants and equipment and
21 procurement planning; and other expenses necessary for
22 the foregoing purposes, including rents and transportation

1 of things; to remain available until expended; ~~(36)\$11,215,-~~
 2 ~~800,000~~ \$3,215,800,000 ~~(37)~~for expenditure during fiscal
 3 year 1952 and thereafter during 1953 and \$8,000,000,000
 4 for expenditure during fiscal year 1953 for the purposes
 5 authorized in this paragraph, of which \$625,000,000 ~~(38)~~of
 6 the \$3,215,800,000 is for payment of obligations in-
 7 curred under authority heretofore granted to enter into
 8 contracts for the foregoing purposes: *Provided*, That the
 9 unexpended balances of the appropriations granted under the
 10 head "Air Corps, Army," 1948, and "General expenses,
 11 U. S. Air Force," 1949, shall remain available until June
 12 30, 1952, for the payment of obligations incurred thereunder
 13 prior to July 1, 1948, and July 1, 1949, respectively.

14 MAJOR PROCUREMENT OTHER THAN AIRCRAFT

15 For procurement of supplies, materials, and equipment,
 16 and spare parts therefor, not otherwise provided for; elec-
 17 tronic and communication equipment; and the purchase of
 18 passenger motor vehicles, ~~(39)\$1,750,000,000~~ \$1,000,-
 19 000,000 ~~(40)~~for expenditure during fiscal year 1952 and
 20 thereafter during 1953 and \$800,000,000 for expenditure
 21 during fiscal year 1953 for the purposes authorized in this
 22 paragraph, to remain available until expended.

23 ACQUISITION AND CONSTRUCTION OF REAL PROPERTY

24 ~~(41)~~For an additional amount for "Acquisition and construc-
 25 tion of real property", to remain available until expended,

1 \$85,000,000, for payment of obligations incurred under
2 authority heretofore granted under this head to enter into
3 contracts.

4 *For the continuation of the construction of four classified*
5 *projects authorized by Public Law 910, Eighty-first Congress,*
6 *approved January 6, 1951, and Public Law 43, Eighty-*
7 *second Congress, approved May 31, 1951, to remain avail-*
8 *able until expended, \$187,300,000 of which \$85,000,000 is*
9 *for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority*
10 *heretofore granted under this heading to enter into contracts.*

11 MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION

12 For expenses necessary for the maintenance, operation,
13 and administration of the activities of the Air Force, includ-
14 ing the United States Air Force Reserve and the Air Re-
15 serve Officers' Training Corps; maintenance, operation, and
16 modification of aircraft; transportation of things; rents at the
17 seat of government and elsewhere, and in administering the
18 provisions of 43 U. S. C. 315q payments of rents may be
19 made in advance; repair of facilities; field printing plants;
20 procurement of ambulances; hire of passenger motor vehicles;
21 training and instruction of military and civilian personnel of
22 the Air Force, including tuition and related expenses; pay,
23 allowances and travel expenses of contract surgeons; utility
24 services for buildings erected at private cost as authorized
25 by law (10 U. S. C. 1346), and buildings on military res-

1 ervations authorized by Air Force regulations to be used for
2 welfare and recreational purposes; rental of land or pur-
3 chase of options to rent land without reference to section
4 3648, Revised Statutes, as amended, use or repair of private
5 property, and other necessary expenses of combat maneuvers;
6 organizational clothing and equipage; payment of exchange
7 fees and exchange losses incurred by Air Force disbursing
8 officers or their agents; losses in the accounts of Air Force
9 disbursing officers as authorized by law (31 U. S. C. 95a;
10 50 U. S. C. 1705-1707; Act of July 26, 1947, Public Law
11 248) ; burial of the dead as authorized by law (10 U. S. C.
12 916-916d; 5 U. S. C. 103a), including remains of person-
13 nel of the Air Force of the United States who die while on
14 active duty, travel allowances of attendants accompanying
15 remains, and acquisition by lease or otherwise of temporary
16 burial sites; conduct of schoolrooms, service clubs, chapels,
17 and other instructional, entertainment, and welfare expenses
18 for enlisted men, not otherwise provided for; expenses for
19 inter-American cooperation as authorized for the Navy by
20 the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 421f), for Latin-
21 American cooperation; payments of deficiency judgments and
22 interests thereon arising out of condemnation proceedings
23 heretofore instituted; and special services by contract or
24 otherwise; \$3,208,442,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, transportation, interest on deposits of enlisted personnel, and travel in kind for cadets and all other personnel of the Air Force of the United States on active duty (other than personnel of the Reserve components, including the Air National Guard, on active duty while undergoing reserve training), including commutation of quarters, subsistence supplies for issue as rations to enlisted personnel, cloth and materials and clothing for issue and sale, and clothing allowances, as authorized by law; and, in connection with personnel paid from this appropriation, for rental of camp sites and local procurement of utility services and other necessary expenses incident to individual or troop movements (including packing and unpacking and transportation of organizational equipment), ice, meals for recruiting parties, monetary allowances for liquid coffee for troops when supplied cooked or travel rations, altering and fitting clothing, and commutation of rations, as authorized by law, to enlisted personnel, including those sick in hospitals (to be paid to the surgeon in charge); transportation, as authorized by law, of dependents, baggage, and household effects of personnel paid from this appropriation; rations for civilian employees when entitled thereto, applicants for enlistment, prisoners of war, and general prisoners;

1 subsistence supplies for resale, as authorized by law; commu-
2 tation of rations, as authorized by regulations, to applicants
3 for enlistment, civilian employees entitled to subsistence at
4 public expense, and general prisoners, while sick in hospitals
5 (to be paid to the surgeon in charge); subsistence of super-
6 numeraries necessitated by emergent military circumstances;
7 issues of toilet articles and barbers' and tailors' material to
8 general prisoners confined at military posts without pay and
9 allowances, applicants for enlistment, and recruits upon first
10 enlistment; civilian clothing and when necessary an overcoat,
11 the cost of all not to exceed \$30, for each person upon each
12 release from a military prison, each enlisted man discharged
13 otherwise than honorably, each enlisted man convicted by a
14 civil court for an offense resulting in confinement in a civil
15 prison, and each enlisted man interned, or discharged with-
16 out internment as an alien enemy; expenses of apprehension
17 and delivery of deserters, stragglers, and escaped military
18 prisoners; payment, in the discretion of the Secretary, of
19 rewards (not to exceed \$25 in any one case) for the appre-
20 hension of deserters; confinement of military prisoners in
21 nonmilitary facilities; donations of not to exceed \$25 to each
22 civilian prisoner upon each release from a military prison, to
23 each enlisted man discharged otherwise than honorably upon
24 each release from confinement under court-martial sentence,

1 and to each person discharged for fraudulent enlistment;
 2 expenses of courts, boards, and commissions; welfare; and
 3 medals and other awards; \$3,016,700,000.

4 RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

5 For expenses necessary for basic and applied scientific
 6 research and development, by contract or otherwise, and
 7 transportation of things, to remain available until expended,
 8 ~~(42)\$425,000,000~~ *\$225,000,000* ~~(43)~~*for expenditure dur-*
 9 *ing fiscal year 1952 and thereafter during 1953 and*
 10 *\$200,000,000 for expenditure during fiscal year 1953 for*
 11 *the purposes authorized in this paragraph.*

12 RESERVE PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS

13 For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, and travel for
 14 personnel of the United States Air Force Reserve and the
 15 Air Reserve Officers' Training Corps, while on active duty
 16 undergoing reserve training or while performing drills or
 17 equivalent duty, or undergoing training and instruction
 18 ~~(44)~~*or on duty under section 5, National Defense Act, as*
 19 *authorized by law; and the procurement and issue of uni-*
 20 *forms to institutions necessary for the training of the Air*
 21 *Reserve Officers' Training Corps, as authorized by law,*
 22 ~~(45)\$17,543,000~~ *\$19,843,000* to remain available until
 23 June 30, 1953.

AIR NATIONAL GUARD

1 For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, transportation
2 (including mileage, actual and necessary expenses, or per
3 diem in lieu thereof), medical and hospital treatment and
4 related expenses, for members of the Air National Guard
5 while undergoing Reserve training or while performing drills
6 or equivalent duty, including officers on duty under section 5,
7 National Defense Act, as authorized by law; travel expenses
8 (other than mileage), on the same basis as authorized by law
9 for Air National Guard personnel on active Federal duty, of
10 Air National Guard commanders while inspecting units in
11 compliance with National Guard regulations when specifically
12 authorized by the Chief, National Guard Bureau; establish-
13 ment, maintenance, operation, repair, and other necessary
14 expenses of facilities for the training and administration of the
15 Air National Guard, including construction of facilities, and
16 additions, extensions, alterations, improvements, and rehabili-
17 tation of existing facilities, as authorized by the Act of
18 September 11, 1950 (Public Law 783); maintenance, oper-
19 ation, and modification of aircraft; transportation of things;
20 purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles; procurement
21 and issue to the Air National Guard of the several
22 States, Territories, and the District of Columbia of
23 supplies, materials, and equipment, as authorized by law;
24

1 and expenses incident to the maintenance and use of
2 supplies, materials, and equipment, including such as
3 may be furnished from stocks under the control of
4 agencies of the Department of Defense; \$87,900,000:
5 *Provided*, That the number of caretakers authorized
6 to be employed under the provisions of law (32 U. S. C.
7 42) may be such as is deemed necessary by the Secretary of
8 the Air Force.

9 CONTINGENCIES

10 For emergencies and military expenses, to be expended
11 on the authority or approval of the Secretary of the Air
12 Force, and such expenses may be accounted for solely on
13 his certificate, \$40,600,000.

14 TITLE VI—GENERAL PROVISIONS

15 SEC. 601. During the current fiscal year, the Secretary
16 of Defense and the Secretaries of the Air Force, Army, and
17 Navy, respectively, if they should deem it advantageous
18 to the national defense, and if in their opinions the existing
19 facilities of the Department of Defense are inadequate, are
20 authorized to procure services in accordance with section 15
21 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), but at rates
22 for individuals not in excess of \$50 per day, and to pay in
23 connection therewith travel expenses of individuals, including
24 actual transportation and per diem in lieu of subsistence while

1 traveling from their homes or places of business to official
2 duty station and return as may be authorized by law: *Pro-*
3 *vided*, That such contracts may be renewed annually.

4 SEC. 602. Section 3648, Revised Statutes, shall not
5 apply, in the case of payments made from appropriations con-
6 tained in this Act, (1) to payments made in compliance
7 with the laws of foreign countries or their ministerial regula-
8 tions, (2) to payments for rent in such countries for such
9 periods as may be necessary to accord with local custom,
10 or (3) to payments made for tuition.

11 SEC. 603. During the current fiscal year, provisions of
12 law prohibiting the payment of compensation to, or employ-
13 ment of, any person not a citizen of the United States shall
14 not apply to personnel of the Department of Defense.

15 SEC. 604. (a) No part of any appropriation contained in
16 this Act for "Pay and allowances" of military personnel
17 shall be used for any other purpose.

18 ~~(46)(b)~~ No part of any appropriation contained in this
19 Act for "Pay and allowances" of military personnel shall
20 be expended for the pay or allowances, accruing after No-
21 vember 30, 1951, of any member of the inactive or volunteer
22 reserve who served on active duty for a period of twelve
23 months or more in any branch of the Armed Forces during
24 the period beginning December 7, 1941, and ending Sep-
25 tember 2, 1945, if such member shall have served on active

1 duty for a period of twelve months or more after June 26,
2 1950, unless such member shall have voluntarily consented
3 to remain on active duty.

4 SEC. 605. The appropriations in this Act otherwise
5 available for travel or transportation which are current
6 on date of relief from duty station of personnel travel-
7 ing under orders may be charged with all expenses in
8 connection with such travel including transportation of de-
9 pendants and household goods, regardless of time of arrival
10 at destination of such personnel.

11 SEC. 606. Appropriations contained in this Act avail-
12 able for travel shall be available for all expenses incident to
13 attendance at meetings of technical, scientific, professional,
14 or other similar organizations.

15 SEC. 607. No part of any money appropriated in this
16 Act or included under any contract authority granted in
17 this Act shall be expended for the payment of any commis-
18 sion on any land purchase contract in excess of 2 per centum
19 of the purchase price.

20 SEC. 608. Such military and naval personnel as may
21 be detailed for duty with agencies not a part of the Depart-
22 ment of Defense on a reimbursement basis may be employed
23 in addition to the numbers otherwise authorized and appro-
24 priated for.

25 SEC. 609. No collection or reclamation shall be made

1 by the United States on account of any money paid to
2 assignees, transferees, or allottees, or to others for them,
3 under assignments, transfers, or allotments of pay and allow-
4 ances made under authority of law where liability might
5 exist with respect to such assignments, transfers, or allot-
6 ments or the use of such moneys, because of the death of
7 assignors, transferors, or allotters.

8 SEC. 610. Appropriations contained in this Act shall
9 be available for insurance of official motor vehicles in
10 foreign countries, when required by laws of such countries;
11 payments in advance of expenses determined by the investi-
12 gating officer to be necessary and in accord with local custom
13 for conducting investigations in foreign countries incident to
14 matters relating to the activities of the department concerned;
15 reimbursement of General Services Administration for se-
16 curity guard services for protection of confidential files;
17 examination of estimates of appropriations and Department
18 of Defense activities in the field and the use of such appro-
19 priations for such purpose shall be subject only to regulation
20 by the standing committees concerned; and all necessary ex-
21 penses, at the seat of government of the United States of
22 America or elsewhere, in connection with (1) instruction and
23 training, including tuition, (47)*specifically approved by the*
24 *Secretary of the Department concerned* and not otherwise
25 provided for, of civilian employees, and (2) communica-

tion and other services and supplies as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act (48): *Provided, That no appropriation contained in this Act, and no funds available from prior appropriations to component departments and agencies of the Department of Defense, shall be used to pay tuition or to make other payments to educational institutions in connection with the instruction or training of employees receiving, or prospective employees who will receive, compensation at a rate below the minimum rate of pay for positions allocated to Grade GS-5 under the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.*

SEC. 611. The appropriations contained in this Act for the Air Force, Navy, and for the Army, which are available for the procurement or manufacture of supplies, materials, and equipment of special or technical design may be used for the development and procurement of gages, dies, jigs, and other special aids and appliances, production studies, factory plans, and other production data, including specifications and detailed drawings, and for the purchase of designs, processes and manufacturing data, copyrights and letters patent, applications therefor, and licenses thereunder pertaining to such supplies, equipment, and materials for which the appropriations are made.

SEC. 612. Any appropriation available to the Air Force, Army, or the Navy may, under such regulations as

1 the Secretary concerned may prescribe, be used for expenses
2 incident to the maintenance, pay, and allowances of prisoners
3 of war, other persons in Air Force, Army, or Navy custody
4 whose status is determined by the Secretary concerned to be
5 similar to prisoners of war, and persons detained in such
6 custody pursuant to Presidential proclamation.

7 SEC. 613. During the current fiscal year, without
8 deposit to the credit of the Treasurer of the United States
9 and withdrawal on money requisitions, receipts of public
10 moneys from sales or other sources by officers of the Depart-
11 ment of Defense on disbursing duty and charged in their
12 official accounts, except receipts to be credited to river and
13 harbor and flood-control appropriations, may be used by them
14 as required for current expenditures, all necessary bookkeep-
15 ing adjustments of appropriations, funds, and accounts to be
16 made in the settlement of their disbursing accounts.

17 SEC. 614. The Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of
18 the Air Force, and the Secretary of the Navy are authorized
19 to expend out of the Appropriations in this Act available for
20 construction or maintenance such amounts as may be required
21 for minor construction (except family quarters), extensions
22 to existing structures, and improvements, at facilities of the
23 Department concerned, but the cost of any project authorized
24 under this section which is not otherwise authorized shall not
25 exceed \$50,000, except that the limitation on the cost of any

1 such project which is determined by the Secretary of Defense
2 to be urgently required in the interests of national defense,
3 shall not exceed \$200,000: *Provided*, That the cost limita-
4 tions of this section shall not apply to amounts authorized to
5 be expended for emergency expenses on the approval of the
6 Secretary concerned.

7 SEC. 615. During the current fiscal year, appropriations
8 contained in this Act (except those for liquidation of
9 prior contract authorizations) shall not be obligated for con-
10 struction of family quarters for personnel at a cost per family
11 unit in excess of \$14,040 on housing units for generals;
12 \$12,040 on housing units for majors, lieutenant colonels and
13 colonels, or equivalent; \$11,040 on housing units for second
14 lieutenants, lieutenants, captains, and warrant officers, or
15 equivalent; or \$10,040 on housing units for enlisted per-
16 sonnel, except that when such units are constructed outside
17 the continental United States or in Alaska, the average cost
18 per unit of all such units shall not exceed \$25,850 and
19 in no event shall the individual cost exceed \$35,000.
20 The last proviso of section 3 of the Act of June 12, 1948
21 (Public Law 626), and the last proviso in the next to last
22 paragraph of section 3 of the Act of June 16, 1948 (Public
23 Law 653), shall not be applicable to appropriations made
24 herein or heretofore to carry out such Acts, in cases where
25 the Secretary of the Department concerned determines that

1 the erection of prefabricated family quarters will be more
2 advantageous to the United States than multiple type dwell-
3 ings of conventional construction.

4 SEC. 616. Appropriations for the Air Force and
5 the Army for the current fiscal year shall be available for
6 carrying out the purposes of Executive Order 9112 of March
7 26, 1942; for expenses in connection with the administration
8 of occupied areas; for distribution of trophies and devices as
9 authorized by law; for actual and necessary expenses or per
10 diem in lieu thereof authorized by law; and, except as other-
11 wise authorized by the Act of September 30, 1950 (Public
12 Law 874), for primary and secondary schooling for depend-
13 ents of military and civilian personnel of the Department of
14 Defense residing on military installations or stationed in for-
15 eign countries, when the Secretary of the department
16 concerned finds that schools, if any, available in the locality,
17 are unable to provide adequately for the education of such
18 dependents; and appropriations for the Air Force for the
19 current fiscal year shall be available for expenses of tem-
20 porary duty travel of military personnel and for travel ex-
21 penses of civilians (other than on permanent change of
22 station) traveling in connection with the activities of the
23 Air Force.

24 SEC. 617. Appropriations for the Navy for the current
25 fiscal year shall be available for expenses in connec-

tion with the transfer to the United States of foreign vessels, including pay, subsistence, transportation, and repatriation of alien crews; expenses including those heretofore incurred incident to the operation by the Navy of private plants taken over at the direction of the President, and the Secretary of the Navy may designate any naval appropriation to be charged with such expenses, proper adjustment to be made on the basis of final costs between applicable appropriations; payment of rewards, as authorized by law, for information leading to the discovery of missing naval property or the recovery thereof, and except as otherwise authorized by the Act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 874), for contributions for the support of schools for dependents of military and civilian personnel of the Department of Defense as authorized by section 13 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 421d).

SEC. 618. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used directly or indirectly except for temporary employment in case of emergency, for the payment of any civilian for services rendered by him on the Canal Zone while occupying a skilled, technical, clerical, administrative, executive, or supervisory position unless such person is a citizen of the United States of America or of the Republic of Panama: *Provided, however,* (1) That, notwithstanding the provision in the Act approved August 11, 1939

1 (53 Stat. 1409), limiting employment in the above-men-
2 tioned positions to citizens of the United States from and
3 after the date of approval of said Act, citizens of Panama
4 may be employed in such positions; (2) that at no time shall
5 the number of Panamanian citizens employed in the above-
6 mentioned positions exceed the number of citizens of the
7 United States so employed, if United States citizens are avail-
8 able in continental United States or on the Canal Zone; (3)
9 that nothing in this Act shall prohibit the continued em-
10 ployment of any person who shall have rendered fifteen
11 or more years of faithful and honorable service on the Canal
12 Zone; (4) that in the selection of personnel for skilled,
13 technical, administrative, clerical, supervisory, or executive
14 positions, the controlling factors in filling these positions shall
15 be efficiency, experience, training, and education; (5) that
16 all citizens of Panama and the United States rendering skilled,
17 technical, clerical, administrative, executive, or supervisory
18 service on the Canal Zone under the terms of this Act
19 (a) shall normally be employed not more than forty hours
20 per week, (b) may receive as compensation equal rates of
21 pay based upon rates paid for similar employment in con-
22 tinental United States plus 25 per centum; (6) this entire
23 section shall apply only to persons employed in skilled, tech-
24 nical, clerical, administrative, executive, or supervisory posi-
25 tions on the Canal Zone directly or indirectly by any branch

1 of the United States Government or by any corporation or
2 company whose stock is owned wholly or in part by the
3 United States Government: *Provided further*, That the
4 President may suspend from time to time in whole or in part
5 compliance with this section if he should deem such course
6 to be in the public interest.

7 SEC. 619. Insofar as practicable, the Secretary of
8 Defense shall assist American small business to participate
9 equitably in the furnishing of commodities and services
10 financed with funds appropriated under this Act by mak-
11 ing available or causing to be made available to suppliers
12 in the United States, and particularly to small independent
13 enterprises, information, as far in advance as possible, with
14 respect to purchases proposed to be financed with funds
15 appropriated under this Act, and by making available or
16 causing to be made available to purchasing and contracting
17 agencies of the Department of Defense information as to
18 commodities and services produced and furnished by small
19 independent enterprises in the United States, and by other-
20 wise helping to give small business an opportunity to partici-
21 pate in the furnishing of commodities and services financed
22 with funds appropriated by this Act.

23 SEC. 620. During the current fiscal year, commuted ra-
24 tions for enlisted personnel of the uniformed services (as
25 defined in the Career Compensation Act of 1949) on leave,

1 or otherwise authorized to mess separately, shall be equiv-
2 alent to the cost of the ration as determined by the Sec-
3 retary of Defense.

4 SEC. 621. No appropriation contained in this Act shall
5 be available for expenses of operation of messes (other
6 than organized messes which are financed principally
7 from nonappropriated funds) at which meals are sold to
8 officers or civilians except under regulations approved by
9 the Secretary of Defense, which shall (except under un-
10 usual or extraordinary circumstances) establish rates for
11 such meals sufficient to provide reimbursement of operating
12 expenses and food costs to the appropriations concerned:
13 *Provided*, That, for the purposes of this section, payments
14 for meals at the rates established hereunder may be made
15 in cash or by deductions from the pay of civilian employees.

16 SEC. 622. No part of any appropriation contained
17 in this Act shall be available until expended unless ex-
18 pressly so provided elsewhere in this or some other appro-
19 priation Act.

20 SEC. 623. No part of any appropriation contained
21 in this Act shall be available for or on account of
22 the supply or replacement of table linen, dishes, glassware,
23 silver, and kitchen utensils for use in the residences or
24 quarters of officers on shore (other than for field messes,
25 messes temporarily set up on shore for bachelor officers and

1 officers attached to seagoing or district defense vessels, to
2 aviation units based on seagoing vessels, to the fleet air bases,
3 to the submarine bases, or to landing forces and expeditions),
4 except in accordance with regulations approved by the Sec-
5 retary of Defense, which shall provide for uniform practices
6 among all of the services.

7 SEC. 624. The provisions of the Act of February 9,
8 1946 (60 Stat. 3), shall be applicable to the appropriations
9 of the Army and Air Force for military pay for the current
10 fiscal year, upon certification by the appropriate agency
11 of the department concerned.

12 SEC. 625. Not more than \$10,000,000 of the amounts
13 received during the current fiscal year by each of the De-
14 partments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force as proceeds
15 from the sale of scrap or salvage materials, shall be available
16 during the current fiscal year for expenses of transportation,
17 demilitarization, and other preparation for sale or salvage
18 of military supplies, equipment, and matériel: *Provided*,
19 That a report of receipts and disbursements under this limita-
20 tion shall be made quarterly to the Committees on Appro-
21 priations of the Congress.

22 SEC. 626. During the current fiscal year, the President
23 may exempt appropriations, funds, and contract author-
24 izations, available for military functions under the Depart-
25 ment of Defense, from the provisions of subsection (c) of

1 section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, whenever
2 he deems such action to be necessary in the interest of
3 national defense.

4 SEC. 627. Appropriations available during the current
5 fiscal year for the pay and allowances of midshipmen ap-
6 pointed under paragraph (b) of section 3 of the Act of
7 August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1058), as amended (34 U. S. C.
8 1020b), shall be available for a 50 per centum increase of
9 the pay of such midshipmen while in flight training or on
10 other flight duty.

11 ~~(49)SEC. 628. No appropriation contained in this Act shall~~
12 ~~be available for any direct expense (including commercial~~
13 ~~transportation in the United States to the place of sale but~~
14 ~~excluding all transportation outside the United States) in~~
15 ~~connection with the maintenance, conduct, operation, or~~
16 ~~management of sales commissaries, or commissary stores, of~~
17 ~~agencies of the Department of Defense, except where reim-~~
18 ~~bursement for such expenses is to be made to the appro-~~
19 ~~priations concerned from the proceeds of sales therein.~~

20 *SEC. 628. No appropriation contained in this Act shall*
21 *be available on and after January 1, 1952, in connection*
22 *with the operation of commissary stores of the agencies of the*
23 *Department of Defense for the cost of purchase and main-*
24 *tenance of operating equipment and supplies and for the*
25 *actual or estimated cost of utilities as may be furnished by the*

1 *Government and of shrinkage, spoilage, and pilferage of*
2 *merchandise under the control of such commissary stores,*
3 *except as authorized under regulations promulgated by the*
4 *Secretaries of the military departments concerned, with the*
5 *approval of the Secretary of Defense, which regulations shall*
6 *provide for reimbursement therefor to the appropriations*
7 *concerned and, notwithstanding any other provision of law,*
8 *shall provide for the adjustment of the sales prices in such*
9 *commissary stores to the extent necessary to furnish sufficient*
10 *gross revenue from sales of commissary stores to make such*
11 *reimbursement: Provided, however, That under such regu-*
12 *lations as may be issued pursuant to this section all utilities*
13 *may be furnished without cost to the commissary stores outside*
14 *the continental United States and in Alaska.* .

15 SEC. 629. No part of any appropriation contained in
16 this Act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any
17 person who engages in a strike against the Government of
18 the United States or who is a member of an organization
19 of Government employees that asserts the right to strike
20 against the Government of the United States, or who ad-
21 vocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates,
22 the overthrow of the Government of the United States by
23 force or violence: *Provided, That for the purposes hereof an*
24 *affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the*
25 *person making the affidavit has not contrary to the provisions*

1 of this section engaged in a strike against the Government of
2 the United States, is not a member of an organization of
3 Government employees that asserts the right to strike against
4 the Government of the United States, or that such person
5 does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization
6 that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the
7 United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That
8 any person who engages in a strike against the Government
9 of the United States or who is a member of an organization
10 of Government employees that asserts the right to strike
11 against the Government of the United States, or who advo-
12 cates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates,
13 the overthrow of the Government of the United States by
14 force or violence and accepts employment the salary or
15 wages for which are paid from any appropriation contained
16 in this Act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction,
17 shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned for not
18 more than one year, or both: *Provided further*, That the
19 above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in
20 substitution for, any other provisions of existing law.

21 ~~(50)~~SEC. 630. *In order more effectively to administer the*
22 *programs and functions of the Department of Defense, the*
23 *President, to the extent he deems it necessary and appropriate*
24 *in the interest of national defense, may authorize within the*
25 *Office of the Secretary of Defense fifteen temporary positions*

1 *for the fiscal year 1952 to be placed in grades GS-17 and*
2 *GS-18 of the general schedule of the Classification Act of*
3 *1949 in accordance with the procedures and standards of*
4 *that Act. Not more than eight of these positions shall be in*
5 *grade GS-18. Such positions shall be additional to the*
6 *number authorized by section 505 of that Act.*

7 **(51)**SEC. 631. *No part of any money appropriated in titles*
8 *II, III, IV, or V of this Act shall be expended under any*
9 *contract (other than a contract for personal services) entered*
10 *into after the enactment of this Act unless such contract*
11 *provides—*

12 *(1) that the Government may, by written notice to*
13 *the contractor, terminate the right of such contractor*
14 *to proceed under such contract if it is found, after notice*
15 *and hearing, by the Secretary of the military depart-*
16 *ment with which the contract is made, or his designee, that*
17 *gratuities (in the form of entertainment, gifts, or other-*
18 *wise) were offered or given by such contractor, or any*
19 *agent or representative of such contractor, to any officer*
20 *or employee of the Government with a view toward*
21 *securing a contract or securing favorable treatment with*
22 *respect to the awarding or amending, or the making of*
23 *any determinations with respect to the performing, of*
24 *such contract: Provided, That the existence of the facts*

1 upon which such Secretary makes such findings shall be
2 in issue and may be reviewed in any competent court,

3 (2) that in the event any such contract is so termi-
4 nated the Government shall be entitled, (A) to pursue
5 the same remedies against the contractor as it could
6 pursue in the event of a breach of the contract by the
7 contractor, and (B) as a penalty in addition to any
8 other damages to which it may be entitled by law, to
9 exemplary damages in an amount not less than three nor
10 more than ten times (as determined by the Secretary or
11 his designee) the costs incurred by any such contractor
12 in providing any such gratuities to any such officer or
13 employee.

14 **(52)**SEC. 632. No funds appropriated in titles II, III, IV,
15 and V of this Act shall be used for the payment in excess
16 of 500,000 full-time graded civilian employees (including
17 (a) the full-time equivalent of part-time employment, (b)
18 persons who are described as "consultants" or who are com-
19 pensated on a "when actually employed" basis if such persons
20 are employed on a contract basis or are paid on a per diem
21 basis, and (c) persons employed without compensation if they
22 are reimbursed for expenses) at any one time during the
23 current fiscal year.

24 **(53)**SEC. 633. Appropriations made by this Act for fiscal
25 year 1952, and appropriations made by this Act for fiscal

1 year 1953, shall, with the least possible reduction of national
 2 defense, be reduced by an amount equal to $2\frac{1}{2}$ per centum of
 3 the total amount of such appropriations.

4 (54)SEC. 634. No part of any appropriation contained in
 5 this Act shall be available for the payment of flight pay to
 6 personnel whose assigned duties do not involve actual combat
 7 missions or do not involve flight in excess of twenty hours
 8 per month.

9 (55)SEC. 635. Funds appropriated by this Act for purposes
 10 of research and development as specified in the Budget esti-
 11 mates are hereby reduced by \$70,000,000.

12 (56)SEC. 636. No part of any appropriations made by this
 13 Act shall be available to reimburse any person for expenses
 14 of travel in any amount in excess of the amount of the
 15 expenses actually incurred by such person in such travel.

16 SEC. (57)637. This Act may be cited as the "De-
 17 partment of Defense Appropriation Act, 1952".

Passed the House of Representatives August 9, 1951.

Attest:

RALPH R. ROBERTS,

Clerk.

Passed the Senate with amendments September 13, 1951.

Attest:

LESLIE L. BIFFLE,

Secretary.

AN ACT

Making appropriations for the National Security Council, the National Security Resources Board, and for military functions administered by the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SEPTEMBER 13, 1951

Ordered to be printed with the amendments of the
Senate numbered

We further request the House committee to review the Hoover Committee's report which condemned the Pick plan. We would strongly urge an investigation of upstream detention behind existing big dams. There is some evidence that this insidious process results in the dams actually causing floods. If this is so, then the Pick plan sells out the farmers on the upland streams for the protection of city areas. And, finally, doesn't protect anyone or anything.

We further submit our conviction that the semblance of demand for the Pick-Sloan plan from Kansas is artificially created and that a little unescorted investigation would reveal a great demand for an inter-agency planned program of flood control utilizing all methods, soil conservation, erosion control, retarding dams on the upper watersheds, large dry dams where feasible, and the Pick-type reservoirs in locations naturally adapted to such, like Kanopolis in Kansas.

We deplore the fact that Kansas Congressmen have been put on the spot by the bulldozer drive originating in Kansas City for the Pick plant. Unless our Senators and Representatives are able to see through the iron curtain of propaganda they may vote out of accordance with the desires of their constituents and find their political careers jeopardized.

All this we respectfully submit to the House Public Works Committee and to all Kansans who may happen to read this editorial.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 725. An act to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Hawaiian Airlines, Ltd.;

H. R. 857. An act for the relief of Mrs. Rose A. Mongrain;

H. R. 2276. An act for the relief of Mary Jane Sherman; and

H. R. 4014. An act to amend section 3121 of the Internal Revenue Code.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4740) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. ROONEY, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. PRESTON, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. CANNON, Mr. STEFAN, Mr. CLEVINGER, and Mr. TABER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5054) making appropriations for the National Security Council, the National Security Resources Board, and for military functions administered by the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], which has been stated, but for the information of the Senate it will be stated again.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Under the heading "Ordnance and facilities," on page 41, at the end of line 17, it is proposed to strike out "\$1,335,668,000" and insert "\$1,320,468,000."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair feels that under the unanimous-consent agreement there should be some disposition of the time consumed by the quorum call. Is it desired that it be charged equally to both sides?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be charged to neither side.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Hayden	McMahon
Bennett	Hendrickson	Millikin
Benton	Hennings	Monroney
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Moody
Bricker	Hill	Morse
Butler, Md.	Hoey	Mundt
Butler, Nebr.	Holland	Murray
Cain	Humphrey	Neely
Capehart	Hunt	Nixon
Carlson	Ives	O'Mahoney
Case	Jenner	Pastore
Clements	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Connally	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Dirksen	Kem	Schoeppel
Douglas	Kerr	Smathers
Duff	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Dworshak	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Eastland	Langer	Smith, N. C.
Eaton	Lehman	Stennis
Ellender	Long	Taft
Ferguson	Martin	Thye
Flanders	Maybank	Underwood
Frear	McCarran	Watkins
Fulbright	McCarthy	Weicker
George	McClellan	Williams
Gillette	McFarland	Young
Green	McKellar	

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent on official business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois, on page 41, line 17. Debate of 30 minutes on the amendment is in order. The time is equally divided between the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. The Senator from Illinois is recognized for 15 minutes, or so much of that time as he may wish to use.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the pending amendment, which is on page 41, line 17, of the bill and proposes to decrease the appropriation from \$1,335,668,000 to \$1,320,468,000 has been re-drafted by me overnight, in order to make clear that the reduction is intended to apply only to the "procurement of plant equipment, appliances, and machine tools, and the installation thereof in naval or private plants." I have taken this wording directly from the language in the bill itself, on page 41, lines 13 to 15, which describe the program I have in mind. The formal text of the changed amendment will be on the desk of the clerk in a moment.

I wish to make it clear that the amendment does not apply to the appropriation for ordnance and facilities as a whole. It does apply to the specific item for which the budget request, according to page 1265 of the House hearings, is \$152,000,000 for machinery to be furnished to private concerns, which I am proposing to reduce to \$136,800,000, thus making a cut of approximately 10 percent. Thus the reduction would amount to \$15,200,000.

This proposal was argued by me late yesterday, and the present amendment raises no new principle. Therefore I do not wish to expand the argument, but merely to point out that we are granting \$9,500,000,000 of tax amortization and loan guaranties for plant expansion and are providing also an appropriation of \$3,000,000,000 for plant equipment and machinery, which will be turned over to private industry for use, although the Government will retain title at least for the time being. With the doubtful fate attending such equipment after the war, judging from our experience after World War II, I believe this amount could with propriety be reduced by 10 percent, particularly in view of the fact that we have also appropriated \$1,100,000,000 to the Army for this purpose for fiscal year 1951, that only \$150,000,000 of that amount was spent during the past year, that only about \$500,000,000 is intended to be spent during the current year, and that even at the end of fiscal year 1952 we will have a residual amount under this former appropriation of approximately \$500,000,000, if it can be constitutionally employed. The Senator from Florida very ably raised the point yesterday that the Constitution forbids a military appropriation to extend for more than 2 years.

In view of all these facts it does not seem to me that the national defense would be endangered by this proposed 10 percent cut in the amount provided for the purchase by the Government of industrial equipment and its use by private industry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator from Illinois send his modified amendment to the desk?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment as modified will be read.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 41, in line 17, it is proposed to strike out "\$1,335,668,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,320,468,000 (of which not more than \$136,800,000 shall be available for pro-

curement of plant equipment, appliances and machine tools, and installation thereof in naval or private plants)."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized in opposition to the amendment as modified.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois showed me the text of the changed or modified amendment which he now offers. Of course it makes much more clear what is proposed to be done by means of the amendment.

As the amendment now reads, as it has been modified, and as the Senator from Illinois has correctly stated, it provides that "not more than \$136,800,000 shall be available for procurement of plant equipment, appliances, and machine tools, and installation thereof in naval or private plants."

The justification for industrial mobilization, as contained in the Budget estimate, carries \$515,000 for reserve plants, \$5,343,000 for machine tools and production equipment, \$15,200,000 for industrial preparedness measures, and \$500,000 for interdepartmental planning. Therefore, it appears that the total for industrial preparedness measures and machine tools is \$20,543,000, and the industrial preparedness measures are exactly \$15,200,000, which is the precise amount of the reduction proposed to be made effective by means of the amendment of the Senator from Illinois.

The Senator should know that this whole item for ordnance and facilities applies to the reworking of guns and the reworking of ammunition and the preparation of materials which presently are being used in the Korean war. It applies to the reworking of torpedoes, bombs, guns, and so forth, for ships and aircraft of the Navy, and the reworking of stored ammunition, to assure its safe handling. Quantities are not planned for procurement in excessive amounts. The consumption rates are based on peace-time use and fleet action in Korea since the first of July. The current operation is reducing the stock. For this purpose it is essential to carry on the purchase of machine tools and industrial mobilization.

I fear that instead of making a mere 10 percent cut in the entire item, the modified amendment of the Senator from Illinois would have the effect, if adopted, of eliminating the entire amount proposed for industrial mobilization.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not wish to prolong this discussion, but I think the Senator from Wyoming has misunderstood the specific clause of this appropriation to which my amendment is directed. He speaks as though it were directed to the appropriation for industrial mobilization, which is a relatively small one, whereas the amendment as modified is directed to the procurement of plant equipment, appliances, and machine tools, and installation thereof in naval or private plants. The latter provision appears on lines 12 to 15, three lines above the words "industrial mobilization," on page 41.

On page 1265 of the House hearings on the Navy budget, this item is listed as

\$152,000,000, requested for the program of purchasing equipment and tools for ordnance and facilities.

So my proposal is for a cut of 10 percent of that amount, or a cut of \$15,200,000, which leaves \$136,800,000 which I mentioned.

I say this in order that the Senator from Wyoming will not think me quite so foolish as to try to reduce an appropriation by more than the total amount of the appropriation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Then, Mr. President, to take the point the Senator from Illinois now has made, let me say that we are dealing with the various items in this general sum. There is a small amount for research and development. There is \$881,000,000 for the procurement of ordnance and ammunition. That is why I was referring to the fact that the supply of ammunition going to Korea is covered by this precise amendment.

Then there is the maintenance of ordnance and ammunition, \$150,000,000; improvements and alterations to facilities, \$87,000,000; cataloging; and then there is industrial mobilization, which the Senator says he does not wish to disturb; and then there is the Naval Reserve.

It seems to me to be clear that if the Senator from Illinois is not proposing that the cut apply to the item for industrial mobilization and the purchase of machine tools, he must necessarily be proposing the cut in the item for the procurement of ordnance and ammunition and the maintenance of ordnance and ammunition.

In the face of the fact that we have consumed great quantities of ammunition and guns in the Korean War, and that guns have to be repaired, I think the amendment should be rejected.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield briefly to me?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes, indeed.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Three facts which I think should be emphasized were either brought out very clearly in the course of the hearings which I was able to attend or are apparent to me from my previous knowledge of naval operations, including naval aviation.

One was that the Navy has gradually been using up the surplus remaining from World War II, particularly as applied to ordnance and ammunition and materials, and before this year those items were almost exhausted; the Navy was almost down to bedrock, so far as those items were concerned.

The second fact is that one of the great shortages we are facing is a shortage in machine tools. The machine-tool industry has been cut down enormously since World War II, and it has been difficult to build it up again.

The third fact is that new forms of ordnance and new forms of weapons are being developed. They constitute marked improvements over the ordnance and weapons available in World War II. For example, I might refer to the bazookas, which require new machine tools, new facilities, and a change from the facilities used in World War II.

All three of those basic facts relate definitely to this appropriation item.

Let me ask the Senator from Wyoming whether it is true that the House cut this appropriation item quite materially, in an amount in excess of \$12,000,000 below the budget estimate, and that cut has not been replaced by the Senate committee.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Massachusetts is quite correct, and I am very grateful for the statement he has made.

Mr. President, the fact of the matter is clearly that this appropriation deals with the guns and the ammunition we are consuming in Korea. The purpose of the appropriation is to maintain our inventory of guns and ammunition so that we shall be ready in the case of an emergency.

Finally, Mr. President, I wish to say to my friend, the Senator from Illinois, that the same question that is in his mind was in my mind during the hearings. I questioned all the armed services about the funds which would be expended for installation of equipment in private plants. I was not particularly concerned about public plants, because I felt that they were in a different category, and I went into that at great length. I came to the conclusion that the place to correct any difficulty which might arise would be in the renegotiation, and I satisfied myself that all contracts for the installation of this equipment in private plants would be subject to renegotiation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say to my good friend from Wyoming that I certainly do not wish to set myself up as an equal authority with him, because his experience and knowledge of this matter are much greater than my own. But, in the old days, when I used to play football, I always felt that it was unsafe to rely exclusively upon the safety man to tackle an opponent who was running with the ball, but that it was well for the humble lineman to try to get at the interference and, if possible, himself, tackle the runner, rather than let the latter sweep through upon the safety man.

It is precisely that reasoning which makes me feel that it might be very advantageous for the Congress to restrict the appropriations, rather than to depend upon the Renegotiation Act; which I fear, will be a very frail reed, indeed, with which to protect the general public, judging from the way in which it emerged from the floor of this body.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, using the analogy of the Senator from Illinois, I hope that in this instance the linemen will not use on the Navy a mouse-trap play. The Appropriations Committee and the Armed Services Committee are going to watch all the expenditure of these appropriations, and I can assure the Senator that the vigilance of these committees will not be relaxed, and that we shall see to it that renegotiation does take place. I hope that the amendment will not be agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas], as modified.

The amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is another amendment which has been offered by the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I should like to call up the amendment on page 47, line 9.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 47, line 9, it is proposed to strike "\$3,215,800,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$3,104,850,000 (of which not more than \$998,547,300 shall be available for project 131, 'Industrial machinery, equipment, and facilities')."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, this is an amendment which is identical with the preceding three, but which is directed to the Air Force, rather than to the Navy. The Senator from Massachusetts, if I understood him correctly, implied yesterday that he thought the case was stronger for such an amendment, as applied to the Air Force, than as applied to the Navy.

Mr. President, I have gone over the record of the hearings of the House committee, and it is quite apparent that the Air Force is turning over enormous amounts of equipment to certain industrial concerns. The material to which I now refer is classified. I believe the contracts have not yet been entered into, but they have been programed. I would like to read some of the total figures, which are truly enormous. Here is one company which is to have turned over to it \$215,980,000 worth of equipment, though the same company has already received \$126,741,000 of accelerated tax amortization certificates. Another company is going to get \$146,450,000 worth of equipment, although it is also receiving, in addition, \$76,079,000 in tax amortization. There is a third company, which has at present no tax amortization, but which is getting \$146,000,000 worth of equipment. If we combine those three figures, we find, very roughly, that they total \$507,000,000 worth of equipment which is being turned over to three industrial giants, whose resources, in their own right, are already enormous, and who are getting well over \$200,000,000 of tax amortization.

In addition to that, there is another company which is to get \$59,000,000 worth of equipment; another company, \$50,000,000 worth of equipment; still another company, \$34,440,000 worth of equipment; another company, \$17,000,000 worth of equipment; another, \$6,000,000 worth of equipment; still another, \$4,900,000 worth of equipment; another company, \$1,475,000 worth of equipment. I have looked up the records in the NPA and DPA and I find that with one exception, all of these firms are also getting substantial sums of tax amortization.

The Air Force is planning to buy over \$1,100,000,000 worth of equipment for these concerns. I admit that some of this program is probably justified, and I want to emphasize the fact that I am not proposing eliminating this program entirely, but am leaving 90 percent of it. But a great deal of the machinery will be available for peacetime use after

the war. It will be installed, however, in the plants of these companies; it will be very costly for the Government to remove and store this equipment, particularly in the case of the heavy presses, and, if the experience of the last war is any guide, much of this equipment will once again be sold at bargain-basement rates to the companies in whose plants it will have been installed. I should also like to point out that \$235,000,000 of this \$1,100,000,000 asked for by the Air Force is at present unprogramed. Those who will expend the money do not know what they are going to do with it, or where it is going to go.

My proposal is very modest. It is to reduce this item by 10 percent, just as the Army figures were reduced by the House.

I think the Senator from Massachusetts may have been unintentionally in error when he said that a 10-percent cut had been applied to the Navy. My understanding is that the 10-percent cut on the installation of equipment had been applied by the House only to the Army; the Navy and the Air Force were exempt from the 10-percent cut. By defeating my three previous amendments, the Senate has now continued the full appropriation for the Navy, and my present amendment proposes to reduce the appropriation for the Air Force by 10 percent.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MURRAY. I should like to inquire whether any study has been made to determine whether small manufacturing concerns, or comparatively small concerns, compared to the large organizations to which the Senator has referred, could be utilized in this program, instead of concentrating the work in the hands of the larger institutions. It seems to me that many of the small manufacturing concerns are going to find increasing difficulty in getting materials with which to continue in civilian production, and there should be some effort to utilize them in the war program.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I quite agree with the Senator from Montana, but I should like to point out that almost half of this \$1,100,000,000 for which the Air Force is asking is to go to three concerns, that virtually 60 percent will go to five concerns, and that \$235,000,000, or about 20 percent, which is still unprogramed may also go to the large concerns. So that this purchase of equipment is designed primarily to build up still further the capital equipment of the industrial giants of the country, and presumably a large proportion of the equipment will be available and useful after the war. This is being done while much of the productive capacity of small concerns remains idle.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I think the statements of the Senator from Illinois are based upon an incorrect assumption. We are dealing here with an appropriation for the aircraft and related programs for the Department of the Air Force. We are dealing, there-

fore, with the building up of the air arm, through the Air Force, to carry on for the Government of the United States and its people, not only in Korea, but in an all-out war if such war should come.

The aircraft which must be constructed cannot be constructed by small business; they can be constructed only by large organizations of aircraft producers. But the record is full of evidence that many contracts for the supplies and parts which go into the production of aircraft are given to small-business concerns.

I want the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] to understand that the Senator from Wyoming is also concerned for the protection of small business, but we are dealing here with the production of aircraft upon which the life of this Nation may depend. From every part of the country every Senator and every Representative receives the inquiry, "Why do we not use these weapons now in Korea?" If the cease-fire negotiations break down it will be essential for us to be ready to use them.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois would cut \$110,950,000 from this item.

Let me explain the procedure by which we are acting. In the first place, of course, it seems to be the unanimous desire of the Congress and of the people to have an expanded air power, both in the United States Air Force and in the Navy. Not only is that true, but the program is so arranged as to depend upon production lines, in the first place, which can be used if all-out mobilization should come. The orders for aircraft are not being made on a large scale; they are necessarily made upon a restricted scale; but we must have production lines which can be utilized when the proper time comes. To take approximately \$110,000,000 out of the amount appropriated would, it seems to me, tend seriously to impair the program.

Of course, the figures are startling; they are staggering. The members of the Appropriations Committee were just as startled as any citizen could possibly be. The estimates for 1952 for complete aircraft amount to \$4,900,000,000. For spare parts they amount to \$4,100,000,000. We must have spare parts and related items. We must have them on hand so that they can be used when any crisis comes. We deal here with a related aircraft program contemplating major modifications and modernization of aircraft with guided missiles, and industrial mobilization, and the estimate for 1952 is \$9,380,000 as compared with \$79,000,000 last year. We have a substantial reduction in this item. The House of Representatives reduced this appropriation by \$50,200,000, and our committee did not restore the reduction in this item. Of course, it did provide an emergency fund for an expanded program.

Mr. President, I hope the amendment will be rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GEORGE in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I call up my amendment identified as "9-10-51-N," and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to add the following new section:

SEC. —. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be available for the payment of flight pay to personnel whose assigned duties do not involve actual combat missions or flight in excess of 40 hours per month.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, this amendment is designed to remedy one of the abuses which developed during the last war. It is not designed to eliminate flight pay entirely. Pilots and air crewmen will continue to receive the flight pay bonus as compensation for the hazards of flight. But the amendment will have the effect of restricting flight pay—to the pilots and air crewmen who fly actual combat missions and who fly regularly on necessary operational and training missions. The flight crews will continue to receive their flight pay; but the amendment will eliminate the aviation "gravy planes" whereby large numbers of administrative and maintenance personnel enjoy the largess which we have been indiscriminately providing for them.

Many aviation officers, although originally trained as pilots, navigators, or bombardiers, are now assigned to ground duties. Under various guises, principally proficiency flying, they are qualifying for flight pay on the basis of only 4 hours' flying time a month. Their few hours in the "blue yonder" are worth \$100 to \$200 extra pay a month. It surely does not make sense that an Air Force second lieutenant on duty at the Pentagon should receive, as an addition to his regular salary, for the few hours a month he spends in the air, more than the infantryman or the sailor receives a month as his total pay for 24 hours' duty a day.

In my judgment, flight pay should serve merely as compensation for hazardous duty. It need not serve as an incentive to attract and keep young men in one particular branch of the services. Maintaining such a favored instrument is not only wasteful, but it also deteriorates the morale of all our servicemen.

It may have been necessary in the 1920's and the 1930's to provide an incentive to build the Army and Navy Air Corps. In those days military service was not an attractive vocation, and flight was tremendously more hazardous than it is today. Today no incentive is needed to attract men to aviation. All must take their turn of service, and to many persons aviation is looked upon with more enthusiasm than in marching with a rifle on one's back or being a sailor.

I emphasize the importance of this amendment. I have figures, which are classified and which I cannot give in debate, but I can say that a very large proportion of the total air pay goes to ground officers whose duties do not ordinarily take them into the air, and who are sent into the air, or who would like

to go into the air, merely to get from \$100 to \$200 extra pay a month.

Mr. President, at this point in my remarks I should like to include tables of the monthly rates of pay and allowances of commissioned officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men on flight duty.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Monthly rates of flight pay allowances of commissioned officers of the Regular Army and Regular Air Force, on active duty, under act Oct. 12, 1949, effective Oct. 1, 1949

Grade and title:	Flying pay (crew member)
0-8. Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff	\$150
0-8. General of the Army or General of the Air Force	150
0-8. Chief of Staff to the President ..	150
0-8. Chief of Staff, U. S. Army, or Chief of Staff, U. S. Air Force ..	150
0-8. General	150
0-8. Lieutenant general	150
0-8. Major general	150
0-7. Brigadier general	150
0-6. Colonel	210
0-5. Lieutenant colonel	180
0-4. Major	150
0-3. Captain	120
0-2. First lieutenant	110
0-1. Second lieutenant	100

Monthly rates of flight pay allowances of warrant officers of the Regular Army and Regular Air Force, on active duty, under act Oct. 12, 1949, effective Oct. 1, 1949

Grade:	Flying pay
W-4	\$100
W-3	100
W-2	100
W-1	100

Monthly rates of flight pay allowances of enlisted personnel of the Regular Army and the Regular Air Force, on active duty, under act Oct. 12, 1949, effective Oct. 1, 1949

Grade and title:	Flying pay (crew member)
E-7:	
Army: Master sergeant	\$75.00
Air Force: Master sergeant	75.00
E-6:	
Army: Sergeant, first class	67.50
Air Force: Technical sergeant	67.50
E-5:	
Army: Sergeant	60.00
Air Force: Staff sergeant	60.00
E-4:	
Army: Corporal (7 or more years service)	52.50
Air Force: Sergeant (7 or more years service)	52.50
E-4:	
Army: Corporal (less than 7 years service)	52.50
Air Force: Sergeant (less than 7 years service)	52.50
E-3:	
Army: Private, first class	45.00
Air Force: Corporal	45.00
E-2:	
Army: Private	37.50
Air Force: Private, first class	37.50
E-1:	
Army: Recruit (4 months or over)	30.00
Air Force: Private (4 months or over)	30.00
E-1:	
Army: Recruit (under 4 months) ..	30.00
Air Force: Private (under 4 months)	30.00
Source: Special Regulations No. 35-1310-1; Air Force Regulations No. 173-108.	

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, my estimate is that probably from \$50,000,000 to \$75,000,000 of extra pay goes into the payment of what I would call "gravy plane" trips. On top of that, there is the gasoline cost. The House Appropriations Committee in the Eighty-first Congress stated that the Government paid out \$200,000,000 in gasoline and maintenance costs of administrative and proficiency flying in order to enable the Government to pay an extra \$75,000,000 in flight pay. For every extra hour of flight pay the gas and maintenance cost three times the salary—See their report on the defense appropriation bill for 1949.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me finish this sentence, and then I shall be glad to yield for a question.

I speak in very guarded fashion when I say that I have made a most conservative estimate that this amendment, if enacted and enforced, will save \$100,000,000 a year, and will remove a great source of easy money which inevitably demoralizes any service.

I shall now be glad to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to call one or two points to the attention of the Senator from Illinois. I think the question he raises is a very proper one, but I question whether this is the proper place at which to raise it. Several years ago in the Armed Services Committee, I listened for several hours—in fact the hearing may have extended over several mornings—to a discussion of this question. The first point has to do with the inducement afforded by extra pay, to get boys with courage, with intellectual capacity, and who are willing to take chances to enter the flying corps.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will the Senator permit me to say that my amendment would still continue the flight bonuses for those who actually do the flying.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I understand.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It would merely discontinue it for those who have ceased to fly on regular assignments, and have become desk officers, and who, as we all know, as a practical matter, go up into the air only in order to get the bonus.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Yes. I was trying to give the reasons presented to us for payment of additional compensation.

Another point is this: If the attempt is made to differentiate between the men who stay on the ground primarily, including administrative officers, and the men who actually do the flying, there will be created in the same service situations which it will be difficult to reconcile. I had in mind, for instance, General Norstab. I name him because he gave us great help in connection with the unification act several years ago. In my opinion, he is a very brilliant, intellectual officer. He was in the Pentagon for several years and was very helpful there. Now he has gone to Europe as commander of our air forces in Europe. He is flying. If there is taken away from a man like General Norstab the opportunity to fly when he is an administrative officer, it is made difficult for him to go overseas and become the head of the

flying forces there. I raise that as the second point.

Then I raise as the third point a term used by a former college professor. He envisaged, if I state it correctly, invidious comparisons between men who are not actually engaged in flying, and their colleagues who actually have some flying duty.

Mr. President, I wish the Senator from Illinois would come before the Armed Services Committee and present this subject. There he would stimulate interest in the question. I do not think by any means we should settle for a long period of years the question of pay for various members of the flying force without discussing the subject thoroughly. I hesitate to think that we should try to cut off flight pay in connection with an appropriation bill. In the first place such a provision would be administratively difficult to do so, and in the second place, it would create uncertainties in the minds of many who are now in certain ways established in their lines of living. I commend the Senator from Illinois for what he is doing, but I do not think he is doing it in the right place.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, it is always a great pleasure to have the Senator from Massachusetts speak on this topic because he always speaks in a characteristically gentlemanly fashion and with great human sympathy and understanding. He is an ornament to the Senate and to his State.

I may say to the Senator that I had hoped when the military pay bill was under consideration, I believe in the last session of the previous Congress, that this issue would have been determined. But for various reasons it was not faced at that time, and my own judgment is that, reluctant as one is to approach it in connection with an appropriation bill, in practice this is about the only way that it will be tackled.

The Senator from Massachusetts made several arguments. The last one was that adoption of my amendment would disturb the existing pattern of life of the ground officers who now get flight pay. I take it that is a sort of "vested interest" argument that we should not disturb what the administrative officers have become accustomed to. My point is that they are being paid at the taxpayers' expense for a service which they do not perform and for a danger which they do not experience. These men are not really in any practical sense flying officers at all. They are ground officers who get real flying officers to take them up for 4 hours a month so they can receive in pay, if they are second lieutenants, \$100 more a month, and if they are colonels, \$210 more a month. No one wants to take anything away from anybody, but I should like to make the point that these men are really taking money from the taxpayers for services which they do not perform and for dangers which they do not experience.

So far as the question is concerned of a man who has been a flight officer and then becomes an administrative officer, and then later becomes a flight officer again, that could be handled by my amendment, providing that for flying 40

hours a month or more he would be entitled to the flight pay. I say it would be very easy for the officer in question, if he had finished his administrative duties, to go to a refresher school and fly his 40 hours a month, and then be able again to receive the flight bonus. But the provision that one can qualify for flight bonus by flying 4 hours, and which time he does not have to spend as a pilot, but can spend as a passenger, seems to me to be a ludicrous yet tragic raid on the public purse. Under that provision, I think every Member of Congress could qualify as a flight officer, because in addition to our flights of fancy, we at least spend 4 hours each month in the air traveling to and fro. So it might be a good idea if we were all made members of the Air Force so we could get from \$100 to \$210 extra a month. Lest anyone should think I am speaking in earnest, on this subject, I will say that that is merely a facetious statement, and not a serious one.

I should like to emphasize that my amendment would not stop proficiency flying, but only the unwarranted bonus pay now given for it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. DOUGLAS. In a moment. There is a tremendous amount of money in this simple provision—\$100,000,000. Furthermore this provision is a source of corruption in a sense, because we find ground officers wanting to get in on the "gravy plane" and the real aviators finding that they are not merely combat men, but that they are in a sense—what shall I call them?—manipulators of aerial perambulators into which are loaded the ground officers in order that the ground officers may get their gravy. It is a degradation, really, of the functions of a fighting air force and has become simply an instrumentality whereby prosperity can be passed around with greater largesse.

I now yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I had intended to make a facetious remark in response to the like words of the Senator from Illinois himself, but after that he used the word "corruption," and I intend therefore to take my own time upon the matter. I shall forego the facetious remark.

Mr. DOUGLAS. When I say it is a source of corruption I simply mean that whenever payment is received for service not performed it has a bad effect upon the morale, both of those who receive the money and those who do not receive it. It is only in that sense that I refer to it as a source of corruption. I did not mean that it is dishonest on the part of those who partake. And it does not seem to me that that phrase is too strong in view of the fact of the payments.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, if the Senator's facts were as he assumes them to be there might be some basis for his assertion that the pay schedule of the Air Force is a source of corruption. The fact of the matter is that in October 1949 the Armed Services Committee reported, and Congress passed a bill

which revised the whole schedule of pay. What the facts may have been before that, I do not know; but I do know that the Air Force is now operating under the act of October 12, 1949. Far from making payments to ground personnel who have lost the art of flying and have lost touch with the needs of flying, the Air Force pursues a very diligent policy of removing officers and men from flying status. The facts are that in 11 months prior to June 1951, 916 officers, ranging in grade from second lieutenant to major general, were removed from flying status and deprived of their right to obtain this incentive pay. They were denied any further flying status because they had become ground personnel. As a matter of fact, as of June 15, last, there were 3,632 pilots and 2,099 other rated personnel on active duty who no longer had flying status and were no longer receiving flying pay. These are the facts, I assure the Senator. The purpose of the Air Force is to deny flying pay to those who are merely doing ground duty.

If it were true that ground personnel were sent up into the air merely for the purpose of gaining flight pay of course it would be wrong. It should not be tolerated. I am quite confident that Secretary Finletter of the Air Force, General Hoyt Vandenberg the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, and the other officials of the Air Force would not for a moment tolerate the payment of flight pay to those who were no longer able and ready to fly.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President will the Senator yield to me for an observation?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am very glad to do so.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Wyoming mentioned the fact that some 900 officers were dropped last year from flying status.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Nine hundred and sixteen officers.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The saving involved would amount to about \$1,250,000 in pay. The saving which I propose would amount to between \$50,000,000 and \$100,000,000.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is based upon—

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to inquire how many officers there are now who, after being taken up in the air for 4 hours each month, get the extra flight pay.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me say to the Senator that he gives a completely incorrect impression when he speaks of 4 hours a month. The regulation requires not 4 hours a month, but 100 hours a year, and it requires that a substantial portion of that time—namely, 20 hours—must be instrument flying, and 15 hours must be night flying. None of the regulations permit any passenger flying, or sitting back in an armchair while the crew, of lower grade, fly the planes. If such a thing were being done I would be the first to condemn it. But no evidence was presented to our committee to that effect. Our committee was in session from the 7th of June until the 8th of August, and no Senator appeared before the committee to make any such com-

plaint at a time when the officers charged would have had the opportunity to answer the charges. I say that no officer charged with performing an act which is a source of corruption should be condemned on this floor without a hearing, when the facts show that the Air Force is diligently denying flying status to officers who are no longer capable of flying.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. My lips are sealed on the question of the absolute figures on this point which I hold in my hand; but I do not think they are sealed as regards the proportion of time spent in this activity. I hold in my hand a table giving an analysis of flying time for July of this year. Approximately one-fifth of the hours in the air were spent on so-called proficiency flying, by pilots who are not in flying jobs.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is another thing—

Mr. DOUGLAS. One-fifth of the total number of hours are devoted to that purpose. An officer can satisfy the requirements for flight pay with 4 hours flying, whereas the average pilot would have to be in the air between 60 and 120 hours during the month. That means that the total costs for this "gravity" plane flying will be much more than one-fifth. My estimate is that more than half the flying pay and flying costs go down the drain in the payment of flight pay to air personnel who are not on flight duty, but on administrative and ground duty, but who are given the opportunity to go up in the air in order to get into the "gravity." I do not know how the Senator would term it, but to me it is a waste of the taxpayers' money. It represents a decrease in air effectiveness, and it is a blow at sound morale.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator has any facts, classified or unclassified, which bear out his assertion that the handling of the incentive pay schedules by the Air Force is a source of corruption, he owes it to himself and to the officers whom he is accusing, as well as to the Air Force, to take the facts before the legislative committee.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I say—

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator will permit me, as the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] has said, the Armed Services Committee has devoted a great deal of time to the problem of incentive pay. We are not dealing with that subject. We are dealing with the appropriations for the Air Force, and we are dealing with the Senator's amendment, which is aimed at correcting an alleged abuse which he says exists, but which he has not proved before any committee. He has not presented the matter to the Appropriations Committee or to the Committee on Armed Services. We are dealing with his amendment.

Mr. President, I desire to read into the RECORD a letter which I received under date of September 11 from Lt. Gen. Charles B. Stone III, lieutenant general, United States Air Force, Deputy Chief of Staff, Comptroller, on this subject. The letter reads as follows:

SEPTEMBER 11, 1951.

Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Chairman, Armed Services Subcommittee,
Committee on Appropriations,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: In line with our telephone conversation this morning, the following information is offered with respect to the necessity and advisability of flying officers on administrative type duties continuing to maintain their flying proficiency. It is frequently alleged that flying officers ordered to Washington are engaged in administrative type duties which do not entail requirement of maintaining flying proficiency.

Basic decisions affecting the support and employment of air power emanate from the Chief of Staff, Washington, D. C. Leadership of United States Air Force air power, therefore, emanates from Washington. The question of maintenance of flying proficiency, of flying officers on duty in Washington directly involves, consequently, the status and qualifications of those who are responsible for air leadership.

The best qualified individuals in the Air Force in their particular spheres of activity are ordered to Washington to exercise air leadership. Washington leadership must be based upon a thorough knowledge of field and battle conditions. Human and technical factors involved in flying must be first-hand knowledge to Washington leaders since the decisions affect flyers and flying operations. Our enemies in World War II did not appreciate this concept of air leadership and made costly mistakes in the employment of air power to the great benefit of the Western Allies.

Duty in Washington is not sought after by Air Force officers. They have great difficulty in maintaining flying proficiency in Washington due to limitation of facilities, transportation difficulties, and the like. Flying officers feel that to do their job they must maintain their flying proficiency. They can do this easier away from Washington. If now it is determined that rated officers ordered to Washington need not fly, every effort will be made by qualified officers who can contribute to air-power leadership to avoid Washington duty. The morale of Air Force leadership would be seriously impaired. The incentive to maintain flying proficiency and to become familiar with the latest developments in air weapons from a pilot's point of view will cease. Flying leadership of the air arm will be of second-rate nature. The Nation's air arm will suffer.

It has been the policy of the Chief of Staff in order to maintain a high grade of qualified leadership in Washington and in the field to rotate officers in and out of Washington. For example, a few of the officers who occupy key positions on the Air staff are listed as follows with their field command duties indicated:

Gen. Hoyt S. Vandenberg, Chief of Staff: Twelfth Air Force (European theater of operations); Ninth Air Force.

Gen. N. F. Twining, Vice Chief of Staff: Twentieth Air Force; Air Technical Service Command.

Lt. Gen. O. R. Cook, Deputy Chief of Staff, Materiel: Seventh Air Service Area Command; Headquarters, Air Materiel Command.

Lt. Gen. T. D. White, Deputy Chief of Staff, Operations: Thirteenth Air Force; Fifth Air Force.

Lt. Gen. C. B. Stone III, Deputy Chief of Staff, Comptroller: India-Burma theater; Fourteenth Air Force.

Maj. Gen. E. S. Wetzel, Acting Deputy Chief of Staff, Personnel: Fifteenth Air Force.

Maj. Gen. R. M. Ramey, Director of Operations, Deputy Chief of Staff, Operations: Eighth Air Force (Strategic Air Command).

Maj. Gen. E. W. Anderson, Assistant Deputy Chief of Staff, Comptroller: Sixty-sev-

enth Combat Wing, Eighth Air Force; First Fighter Command, Mitchel Field.

Likewise, a few of the officers who have served on the Air Staff and are currently engaged in command of field units are listed as follows:

Lt. Gen. C. E. LeMay: Commanding general, Strategic Air Command.

Lt. Gen. Lauris Norstad: Commander in Chief, United States Air Force in Europe.

Lt. Gen. E. E. Partridge: Commanding general, Air Research and Development Command.

Lt. Gen. O. P. Weyland: Commanding general, Far East Air Forces.

Maj. Gen. F. F. Everest: Commanding general, Fifth Air Force.

Maj. Gen. D. C. Strother: Commanding general, Twelfth Air Force, United States Air Force in Europe.

Maj. Gen. Emmett O'Donnell, Jr.: Commanding general, Fifteenth Air Force (Strategic Air Command).

Usually the reason for advocates of eliminating flying training from the duties of Washington rated officers is occasioned by the thought that considerable savings in money will be entailed. An estimate of the amount of dollars which would be saved if this were put into effect at the present strength of rated officers on duty in the Air Staff is approximately \$2,500,000. This minor amount of savings would in no sense compensate for the dilatory effect upon those responsible for air leadership. The tremendous harm to the effectiveness of the Nation's air arm as a result of lowered leadership effectiveness could be disastrous.

Sincerely,

CHARLES B. STONE III,
Lieutenant General, United States
Air Force, Deputy Chief of Staff,
Comptroller.

I yield time to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I wish to say merely a few words on the pending amendment. I am in sympathy with the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] in what he proposes. I feel that the flight pay legislation was passed at a time when flying was considered a hazardous employment, in an attempt to increase the number of flyers in the Air Corps. Therefore provision was made for extra compensation to be paid to aviators. I believe the time has come when men who actually do the flying should be the only ones who should be thus compensated. Men who are not employed as flyers should not take planes and fly them for only 4 hours a month and get extra compensation for doing so.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator will permit me, I should like to remind him that no officer or enlisted man could get flight pay for merely 4 hours of flying. It requires 100 hours a year.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is the minimum flight time required.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct. It averages about 2 hours a week. For the good of the service and for the benefit of those whose job it is actually to fly planes, aviators who are engaged in flying should receive extra compensation, but those who are not engaged in flying should not be paid extra compensation. The mere fact that they fly a few hours a month in order to keep their hand in, so to speak, with planes as they are constructed now, should not entitle them to extra compensation.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Every Representative and every Senator in the discharge of his duties spends 100 hours or more in the air, either traveling abroad, on trips of investigation, or on trips home, which are required by his duties. I wonder whether, in line with the discussion here, it would not be proper to pay Representatives and Senators extra compensation because they must travel on commercial airlines.

Mr. FERGUSON. I would not want to answer that question. I do not agree that Representatives and Senators should have extra compensation for such flying.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Of course, the Senator from Michigan understands that I was facetious in asking my question.

Mr. FERGUSON. I realize that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Michigan has expired.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hendrickson	McMahon
Bennett	Hennings	Millikin
Benton	Hickenlooper	Monroney
Brewster	Hill	Moody
Bricker	Hoey	Morse
Butler, Md.	Holland	Mundt
Butler, Nebr.	Humphrey	Murray
Cain	Hunt	Neely
Carlson	Ives	Nixon
Case	Jenner	O'Mahoney
Clements	Johnson, Colo.	Pastore
Connally	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Dirksen	Kem	Schoeppel
Douglas	Kerr	Smathers
Dworshak	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Eastland	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Ecton	Langer	Smith, N. C.
Ellender	Lehman	Stennis
Ferguson	Long	Taft
Flanders	Martin	Thye
Frear	Maybank	Underwood
Fulbright	McCarran	Watkins
George	McCarthy	Welker
Gillette	McClellan	Williams
Green	McFarland	Young
Hayden	McKellar	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment lettered "N," submitted by the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, to the pending amendment I submit the following amendment: Strike out "forty hours per month" and insert "twenty hours per month."

I wonder whether the Senator from Illinois will accept that amendment to his amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am very glad to accept that amendment to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment lettered "N" of the Senator from Illinois, as modified.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No further debate on the amendment is in order.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. However, Mr. President, the amendment has now been amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois has perfected his amendment by modifying it, and the amendment has already been debated.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, does not a Senator who submits an amendment have a right to amend it or modify it?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Then in order to remove any parliamentary difficulty—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A Senator who submits an amendment has a right to modify it; but under the unanimous-consent agreement now in effect, a modification of an amendment does not extend the time for debate on the amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In the amendment I move to strike out "forty" and insert "twenty."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Such a modification to the amendment has already been accepted by the Senator submitting the amendment.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, is an amendment to the amendment as modified in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; for it would be an amendment in the second degree.

Mr. MAYBANK. I move to amend the amendment, as modified, by striking out "twenty" and inserting "ten." I submit that amendment to the amendment as modified only in order to permit the amendment as modified to be discussed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized for 15 minutes on his amendment to the amendment as modified.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I yield my time to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am disposed to come to some sort of an understanding upon the amendment, but I wish to point out that the monthly base is not the proper base upon which to compute the time of flight pay. It should be made perfectly clear to all Members of the Senate that the policy of the Air Force is, first, to ground officers who are no longer capable of flying. They do not receive flight pay.

The policy of the Air Force is to keep the administrative personnel in close touch with the advance in the art of aerial navigation. Planes are being improved month by month. The acquisition of flying status last year is not sufficient to keep an officer in touch with growing air power.

Therefore, an amendment which would have the effect, based upon the conception—in fact, Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois used the word "corruption" or the words "source of corruption," although, of course, he did not mean that—that the Air Force is being administered as though it were a gravy train, when the facts before us are that men from Washington have been sent to Korea—

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I did not say the Air Force was administered as though it were a gravy train, but I said this type of pay constituted a gravy plane, p-l-a-n-e.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, that is a distinction without a difference, according to my view.

If the charge be true, then it is a matter for investigation by the Armed Services Committee. However, I wish the Members of the Senate to know that the Senator from Illinois did not come before the Appropriations Committee with any allegation of improper action by any single individual. If we believe in the time-honored custom that before a person is to be convicted, he shall have an opportunity to present his side of the case, then certainly we are not going to vote for an amendment of this character.

If it is the desire of the Senator from Illinois to have this matter examined in a regular manner by the committee of conference, then I should be very glad to accept an amendment which would be based upon the present rule; and then it would be wholly within the power of the conference to accept the amendment, if the Senator from Illinois could present sufficient evidence on the matter. I assure him that he will be invited to do so in the conference.

If the amendment were based upon 100 hours of flying for 1 year, as is the rule, I would be disposed to accept the amendment.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wish to ask whether it is a fact that during all the hearings and the writing up of the bill we were particular not to interfere with the jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee; and in the case of some amendments, we did not accept them when we believed that to do so would be to interfere with the jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course, that is true.

Mr. President, I want the Senate to know that many of the administrative officers have been returned to flying status in Korea. Had this amendment been in effect it would have been impossible for that to happen, because it is only by continuous training and the operation of planes that administrative officers can keep up with jet developments and the other developments in the Air Force.

I think it would be an extremely improper reflection upon the United States Air Force to adopt an amendment like the one originally proposed, but, as I say, if the Senator would accept the amendment making the requirement 100 hours a year, we would then have some basis for analysis of the whole question.

Mr. President, I have no more to say. I shall ask for the yeas and nays upon this amendment, but before I do that, I want every Senator who in the great crisis facing the United States believes in the expansion of air power to keep in mind in voting upon this amendment that it amounts to a conviction without trial, upon an allegation unsupported by evidence.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I merely want to state that I am in thorough accord with what the chairman of the subcommittee has said, but I do not

see why the officers of the Army Air Force or of the Navy Air Force, or of any other air force, such as that of the Marines, should be mentioned. I withdraw the amendment which I proposed to the amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, before the Senator withdraws his amendment, would he be willing to yield 2 or 3 minutes to me?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the charge has been made that I have made an unsupported allegation. We have amongst us a very distinguished Member of this body, the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], who was, I believe, attached to an aviation group during the late war, who can speak from personal experience on this matter. I should like to ask the junior Senator from Florida whether it is not true that a great many administrative officers received flight pay after having remained in the air only 4 hours a month.

Mr. SMATHERS. If the Senator will yield, Mr. President, let me say, first, that I was attached to an aviation squadron for the better part of the war, and I did know, and do know, that the only requirement was that officers spend 4 hours a month in the air. Frequently some of them would spend 4 hours a month in the air without ever flying a plane, but merely riding. I have seen that many times, and I think it is well known by persons in the service.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. May I ask the Senator when that happened?

Mr. SMATHERS. I saw it happen many times, as late as 1947.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Does the Senator know that a law on the subject was changed on October 12, 1949, and that the Air Force is now operating under completely new rules? The amendment now pending, as written, would deprive of flight pay a man who was flying in combat.

Mr. DOUGLAS. No.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. As it is written, it would do that.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Not so; not so. I invite the Senator to reread the amendment. It specifically exempts combat fliers from its provisions.

Mr. SMATHERS. I may say I did not know that the law was changed. I do not know what the law is now.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, is it not true that an officer who flies 19 hours in combat would be deprived of the advantage of flight pay, under the amendment?

Mr. SMATHERS. The law was that if they flew 4 hours a month, they were entitled to receive flight pay. If it has been changed, I do not know what the law is now. Perhaps it provides for 100 hours a year. If they have that much time in the air, they may get it. They do not have to fly a plane themselves.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, if the Senator from Illinois will yield, I should like to ask the junior Senator from Florida a question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. FREAR. I should like to know which part of the war was "the better part of the war."

Mr. SMATHERS. I did not know there was any good part of the war. I do not quite understand the question.

Mr. FREAR. In his statement the junior Senator from Florida referred to "the better part of the war," and I wondered which part that was.

Mr. SMATHERS. I wish to correct myself. I was speaking in terms of length of service.

Mr. FREAR. Speaking seriously, I should like to ask the junior Senator from Illinois whether there is any additional pay given the foot soldier who faces the enemy in battle, other than his regular pay.

Mr. DOUGLAS. He receives combat pay.

Mr. FREAR. What does it amount to?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Under the present schedule, it amounts to \$10 a month, or from one-tenth to one-twentieth of the amounts given for flight pay of desk officers in the Air Force and naval aviation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois permit me to answer that question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The enlisted men receive extra pay.

Mr. DOUGLAS. For a second lieutenant, the flight pay is \$100 a month, rising to \$110 for the first lieutenant, rising to \$120 for the captain, and, I believe, rising to \$210 for the colonel.

Mr. FREAR. Then, if I may ask another question, how is the extra pay for the combat soldier arrived at? Is it determined on the basis of the number of hours he is on the front line a month?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No.

Mr. FREAR. What is the basis for computing his combat pay?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Only that he is a combat soldier.

Mr. FREAR. Did the Senator not desire to answer my question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I beg the Senator's pardon. The sole criterion is that a soldier must be in the combat area. Naturally, it would not be based upon 24 hours' duty in combat, but upon his being in a combat area, which is sometimes loosely defined.

Mr. FREAR. That is what I was trying to bring out.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is the understanding of the Senator from Florida correct, to this effect, that in flying under orders, in actual combat missions, the flyer will be qualified for flight pay, under this amendment?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct, regardless of the actual number of hours he flies.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes, indeed.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it the intention of the Senator, in the use of the word "involve" as it appears in his amendment in connection with the words

"assigned duties" to correct the understanding and the interpretation that the flying must be required under the duties to which the office is at the time assigned?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That was my intention.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. Did I correctly understand it to be said that this amendment would disqualify a man in combat from receiving flight pay if he flew less than 20 hours?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Oh, no, that was said by the Senator from Wyoming, but I am sure it was said through inadvertence, because the text provides that the disqualification shall apply only to those whose assigned duties do not involve actual combat missions of flight, namely, do not require it, or flight in excess of 40 hours a month; so that if a man were in combat even for 1 hour a month, he would get the flight pay.

Mr. SMATHERS. I appreciate that statement; and I wanted to make the observation, that even when the 4-hour limitation was in effect, before 1949, if a man flew one mission and happened to be shot down and never to fly another mission during the remainder of that month, that did not disqualify him from receiving his flight pay.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It did not, and should not.

Mr. SMATHERS. In the combat area, he was entitled to it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Every lawyer knows that it is not what the person who draws a statute thinks he is doing, but what the interpreting official reads into the statute, which controls. The Senator from Illinois I know is very capable in the art of putting words together, but the fact of the matter is that the phrase "20 hours per month," as this amendment is drafted, refers both to actual combat missions and to flight. In order to escape that, I will tell the Senator from Illinois how to rewrite his amendment, if he desires to have me do so.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, there is an old maxim which says, "Beware of Greeks bearing gifts." I have great affection for the Senator from Wyoming, but I have considerable apprehension of the consequences if he starts to rewrite my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Has the time of the Senator from Illinois expired?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois did not have any time. The Senator from South Carolina offered an amendment, and subsequently said he desired to withdraw it. The Senator withheld his withdrawal of it so as to permit the Senator from Illinois to conclude his statement.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Chair is correct. I withdrew my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has expired.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the amendment, and my purpose in offering it is to remove any ambiguity. I want the Senator from Illinois to know that I am not offering a Trojan horse.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment has been amended three times. The Senator from Wyoming may state his amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In line 4, after the word "or", I move to insert the words "or do not involve."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I accept that amendment. The Greeks are doing very well today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming.

The CHIEF CLERK. As proposed to be modified by Mr. O'MAHONEY, the amendment reads as follows:

No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be available for the payment of flight pay to personnel whose assigned duties do not involve actual combat missions or do not involve flight in excess of 20 hours per month.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. FERGUSON. Has all time for debate expired?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time for debate has expired except upon the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, on this amendment I merely desire to make the statement that the fact that I was able to propose it and that the Senator from Illinois was ready to accept it is an acknowledgment that the error which I found in the amendment was an actual error, and that it is being corrected. It also illustrates the desirability of referring to committees basic alterations of the armed service laws of the United States. We should not attempt to change them on the floor of the Senate.

I shall ask for the yeas and nays—

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is there any time for debate remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no time remaining. The Senator from Illinois has accepted the modification of his amendment. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], as modified. The Senator from Wyoming has asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll, and Mr. AIKEN voted "yea" when his name was called.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am completely mystified as to what the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming does to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois. I do not understand it. It would seem to me that Senators should know what they are voting on.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is not permitted to allow further discussion, under the unanimous-consent agreement. The clerk will again state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. The amendment, as modified, reads as follows:

No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be available for the payment of flight pay to personnel whose assigned duties do not involve actual combat missions or do not involve flight in excess of 20 hours per month.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, would it be permissible for the Senator from Washington to ask one question of the Senator from Illinois?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time for debate has expired. The clerk will resume the call of the roll.

The legislative clerk resumed and concluded the call of the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senators from Virginia [Mr. BYRD and Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent on official business.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] is absent by leave of the Senate and, if present, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] are detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 49, nays 31, as follows:

YEAS—49

Aiken	Eastland	Ives
Bennett	Ferguson	Jenner
Benton	Flanders	Johnson, Colo.
Brewster	Frear	Johnston, S. C.
Bricker	Fulbright	Kern
Butler, Md.	George	Kilgore
Butler, Nebr.	Gillette	Langer
Carlson	Hendrickson	Martin
Case	Hennings	McCarthy
Connally	Hickenlooper	Millikin
Dirksen	Hoey	Moody
Douglas	Holland	Mundt
Dworshak	Humphrey	Nixon

Schoeppel
Smathers
Smith, Maine
Smith, N. J.

Stennis
Taft
Thye
Watkins

Welker
Williams

NAYS—31

Cain
Clements
Cordon
Ecton
Ellender
Green
Hayden
Hill
Hunt
Johnson, Tex.
Kerr

Knowland
Lehman
Long
Maybank
McCarran
McClellan
McFarland
McKellar
McMahon
Monroney
Morse

Murray
Neely
O'Mahoney
Pastore
Russell
Saltonstall
Smith, N. C.
Underwood
Young

NOT VOTING—16

Anderson
Bridges
Byrd
Capehart
Chavez
Duff

Kefauver
Lodge
Magnuson
Malone
O'Connor
Robertson

So Mr. DOUGLAS' amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the Douglas amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I move to table the motion to reconsider.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Illinois to table the motion to reconsider.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I call up my amendment 9-12-51-C.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 65, line 23, after the period it is proposed to insert the following new paragraph:

The amounts appropriated by this act under the following headings which shall be available for the following objects shall not exceed the total of the amounts specified for such objects in the budget estimates less \$200,000,000:

TITLE III

Heading and objects

Finance service: Personal services.
Incidental expenses of the Army: Other contractual services.
Transportation service, Army: Equipment, other contractual services, and transportation of things.
Chemical services, Army: Personal services.
Military construction, Army civilian components: Lands and structures.
Contingent expenses, Department of the Army: Printing and reproduction.

TITLE IV

Navy personnel, general expenses: Supplies and materials.
Marine Corps troops and facilities: Personal services, supplies and materials, and equipment.
Aircraft and facilities: Personal services, supplies and materials, and equipment.
Construction of aircraft and related procurement: Aircraft to be used in the transaction of official business of the Navy Department.
Ships and facilities: Personal services.
Construction of ships: Personal services.
Shipbuilding and conversion: Personal services.
Ordnance and facilities: Personal services.
Civil engineering: Personal services, supplies and materials, and equipment.
Service-wide supply and finance: Personal services, and transportation of things.
Service-wide operations: Equipment.

TITLE V

Maintenance and operation: Personal services, supplies and materials, and equipment.

The reductions required by this section shall be apportioned as follows: (1) The appropriation made in title IV under the heading "Construction of aircraft" shall be reduced by \$20,000,000; (2) the appropriation made in title V under the heading "Maintenance and operation" is reduced by \$50,000,000; and (3) reductions of \$130,000,000 shall be apportioned by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget among the remaining objects specified, the reduction under any heading to be not less than \$1,000,000 nor more than \$18,000,000.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I must say that I feel somewhat flushed by the unexpected but nonetheless welcome vote on the last amendment, which should save the Government between \$50,000,000 and \$100,000,000. That emboldens me to offer the amendment just stated, which is designed to make a further saving of \$200,000,000.

This figure of \$200,000,000 has not been picked out of the air. It is the result of a very careful analysis which I tried to make of the entire military budget. However, I am not dictating in this amendment the precise distribution of all the economies among the remain-

ing items, but I am leaving to the Bureau of the Budget the determination as to how a cut of \$130,000,000 of the \$200,000,000 is to be distributed.

I may say that this cut which I propose is aimed entirely at overhead. Upon studying the budget, not only by items, but also by objects within items, I listed reductions which I thought could be made without impairing our armed strength, and I ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point a table of these reductions.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Suggested allocation of \$200,000,000 general reduction proposed by Senator Douglas to defense appropriations bill

[Percentages noted are percentages of amounts budgeted for objects listed]

	Civilian personnel	Per-cent	Materials and supplies	Per-cent	Equip-ment	Per-cent	Other contractual services	Per-cent	Transportation of things	Per-cent	Lands and structures	Per-cent	Printing and reproduction	Per-cent
ARMY														
Finance Corps:														
Finance Service.....	\$2,500,000	5												
Incidental expenses of the Army.....					\$3,000,000	18								
Transportation Service.....					4,500,000	2	\$6,000,000	2	\$6,000,000	2				
Chemical Corps: Chemical Service.....	1,000,000	3												
Military construction: Civilian components.....											\$16,000,000	100		
Contingent expenses.....													\$2,500,000	10
NAVY														
Personnel: General expenses.....	2,000,000	5	1,000,000	6										
Marine Corps troops and facilities.....	2,500,000	5	3,000,000	1	7,000,000	1								
Aircraft and facilities.....	13,000,000		4,000,000	2	6,000,000	2								
Construction of aircraft.....					120,000,000	2½								
Ships and facilities.....	13,000,000	5												
Construction of ships.....	4,500,000	5												
Shipbuilding and conversion.....	2,000,000	5												
Ordnance and facilities.....	8,000,000	5												
Civil engineering.....	2,000,000	5	1,000,000	4	1,500,000	2								
Service-wide supply and finance.....	11,000,000	5							3,000,000	25				
Service-wide operations.....					1,000,000	3								
AIR FORCE														
Maintenance and operation.....	18,000,000	2	24,000,000	2	9,000,000	2								
Total reductions.....	80,500,000		33,000,000		49,000,000		9,000,000		9,000,000		16,000,000		2,500,000	
Grand total.....	200,000,000													

¹ 10 percent of administrative aircraft.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, these are suggested reductions, but they are not mandatory except a reduction in the case of the construction of aircraft, of \$20,000,000, and in the maintenance and operation costs of \$50,000,000. My amendment would, however, set limitations on the amount any single item could be reduced. Each item, except the two I just mentioned, would have to be cut by at least \$1,000,000, but not more than \$18,000,000.

I may say that in general this amendment does not conflict in any sense with the amendment to be offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]. I repeat, so far as I can see, the savings which I am suggesting do not overlap to any appreciable degree the economies proposed by the Senator from South Dakota, namely, a saving of 1 percent on the procurement items. The amendment is designed to reduce civilian personnel from 3 to 5 percent, with a total saving of approximately \$80,000,000. So far as personnel is concerned, it will make effective the reduction in the number of personnel which we adopted yesterday when we placed 500,000 as the limit instead of 530,000. That reduction,

which was sponsored by the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and other Senators, was, I think, a very proper one.

But, in order definitely to close the gate, it is necessary to reduce the amounts of money as well as to reduce the number of persons; otherwise it will be within the power of the Department of Defense, while they pay less for personnel, to shift the appropriations from personnel to other purposes. Therefore, about \$80,000,000 of this economy is not really a fresh economy; it merely reinforces the action of the Senate of yesterday. It will close the hatches down on the economy which we tried to effect yesterday and make further reductions in overhead of \$120,000,000.

There are certain items in the bill before us which I think could certainly be omitted with propriety. We have had discussions from time to time of the advertising expense for recruiting of \$3,000,000 which the Army is asking to be made available during the coming year. I think it has been developed by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and other Senators that this

item tends to be a totally unnecessary expense, certainly in a period of compulsory military service. I should like to remind the Senate also that on every dollar spent in advertising a 15-percent commission or kick-back goes to the agent who places the advertising. So that concealed within that \$3,000,000 figure is a \$450,000 commission for some agency or some persons.

In addition, I think it should be pointed out that advertisements for sales of war bonds are donated by magazines and newspapers. Inasmuch as many of these receive what amounts to a subsidy in the form of low mailing rates, I should think they could extend their donations of advertising space to include recruitment advertising. So I think that item certainly could be dispensed with.

The bill calls for an appropriation of \$16,000,000 for the construction of armories. We have large numbers of armories now. After all, troops are trained not so much in indoor drill halls as in the field. About all that can be given in the armory is close-order drill, plus some practice with a rifle once a week. Although there would be fewer places in which to hold Jefferson-Jackson day and

Lincoln day dinners, this is an item which most certainly might be omitted so far as our armed strength is concerned.

I think a reduction should also be made in the purchase of administrative aircraft for the Navy. The Navy is proposing to purchase 95 planes at an average cost of \$2,250,000 a plane, to be used for administrative purposes only. That item is found on page 26 of the budget submitted by the Department of Defense, House Document No. 120. It comes to a total of almost precisely \$215,000,000. Those are luxurious planes, the same planes as are used by the commercial airlines. Their cost of \$2,250,000 apiece seems to be very excessive. It would seem to me that there would be no impairment of military efficiency if we were to reduce this amount by 10 percent, so that there would be \$195,000,000 for this purpose, or about 87 planes, instead of \$215,000,000 for 95 planes.

There are a number of other overhead items as well. In short, this is a proposal to cut \$200,000,000 from the nonprocurement, nonessential features of the Defense budget.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield to me?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to raise a point of order in connection with the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois, in that the language on page 2, line 6 of the amendment is legislation on an appropriation bill, and is therefore out of order. The language to which I refer is:

Reductions of \$130,000,000 shall be apportioned by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget among the remaining objects specified, the reduction under any heading to be not less than \$1,000,000 or more than \$18,000,000.

This language constitutes legislation on an appropriation bill, and therefore the amendment is out of order.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Chair permit argument on this question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order may be ruled upon without debate. That is within the discretion of the Chair. If the Senator wishes to be heard for 5 minutes, the Chair will be glad to hear the Senator.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly I do not wish to instruct on this point so eminent a parliamentarian as the distinguished Senator from Georgia, who now occupies the chair. I merely say that I do not see how this language can be said to be legislation. It is simply an attempt to reduce the total amount of appropriations, and to mark out the areas within which economies are to be made, allowing some discretion to the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I reply by saying that the language itself legislates specific discretion to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. I, for one, do not believe that we ought to establish a precedent by leaving to the discretionary power of an administrative officer a legislative function of the Congress to determine exactly how cuts are

to be made when they are to be made. I believe that if we are to make cuts we ought to make them specifically, item by item, and not legislate by giving discretion to someone else to do the job for us.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If I may argue the point, I had not thought that at the moment we were discussing the merits of the amendment. I thought the distinguished Senator from Oregon, who is an eminent legal authority, was addressing himself to the point that the amendment is legislation.

I wish to make two points. First, the amendment is not legislation. It makes reductions in specific areas. It provides no broad grant of discretion since it sets limits on the amounts to be reduced. Secondly, if it were legislation, it is attached to section 623, on page 65, which is already legislation. Therefore, the amendment should be in order.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I reply to my good friend from Illinois by saying that we cannot pass judgment on whether or not the amendment is legislation until we look to the effect of the language. All I have brought out is the effect of the language, and the discretionary power which it would legislatively vest in the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is ready to rule.

This amendment would seem to be open to the objection raised in the point of order, beginning with the word "and" in line 6 on page 2 of the amendment, because it is not merely a limitation, which is permissible on a general appropriation bill, but it also gives affirmative direction to an executive officer of the Government. So that part of the amendment seems to be subject to the point of order.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, may I ask if the objection would be removed if, in line 7, the amendment were altered to read:

Reductions of \$130,000,000 shall be apportioned by the Committee on Appropriations of the United States Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It would still be subject to the same objection which the Chair has stated. It would impose an additional duty upon the administrative or executive officers. The Chair thinks, therefore, that if this portion of the amendment, beginning with the word "and" in line 6 on page 2 of the amendment were retained, it would vitiate the entire amendment, and it would be subject to a point of order.

The Chair sustains the point of order.

The bill is before the Senate and open to amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I offer my amendment designated "9-10-51-P," which I should like to have designated section 633 (b).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to add the following new section:

SEC. 633 (b). Funds appropriated by this act for purposes of research and development as specified in the budget estimates are hereby reduced by \$70,000,000.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, we have an extraordinary situation so far as research is concerned. The hearings, and the budget submitted, indicate that the three branches of the armed services, plus the Secretary of Defense, are asking for a total of \$1,472,632,000 for purposes of research.

At the same time, the House has refused an appropriation of \$14,000,000—1 percent of that figure—for the National Science Foundation, and has confined the appropriations for that body to \$300,000. In other words, we are spending \$1,500,000,000 for research for the military agency, at a time when at least one branch of the Congress is refusing to appropriate 1 percent of that figure for basic research, from which has come such things as the atomic bomb, radar, and a host of other valuable contributions to national defense. I think this is an extraordinary disproportion of effort.

The effect of my amendment is to bring about a reduction of \$70,000,000 from a total of more than \$1,472,000,000. That is a 5-percent reduction. In the first place, it seems to me that a part of the reduction proposed in the total amount to be devoted to developmental research for the military could with profit be used by the National Science Foundation.

I may say that if this reduction is carried into effect and is enacted in the final version of this act, when a supplemental deficiency bill comes before us—and I am told that we shall have a supplemental deficiency bill before us, in which I dare say all the economies which Congress thought it had made in the original bill will be canceled out by the good arithmetic of our efficient administrators—I intend to move that \$14,000,000 be added to the appropriation for the National Science Foundation. In other words, I propose that we devote to basic research 1 percent of the amount which we now spend for developmental research for destruction. If this reduction of \$70,000,000 is made, we can devote \$14,000,000 more to basic research. The taxpayers will benefit to the extent of \$56,000,000, and we shall not fall behind Russia in our scientific discoveries. Let us not forget that it was the basic research of Faraday which gave us the whole electrical industry and that the atom bomb could not have been developed without the discoveries in pure science of Einstein, Bohr, V. Dempster, and others.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, for the information of the distinguished Senator from Illinois, let me say that the Committee on Appropriations discussed the National Science Foundation appropriation this morning, and undoubtedly will discuss it further in its study of the very question which the Senator from Illinois has raised. I believe the appropriation for the National Science Foundation should be increased.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I appreciate the Senator's remarks. The best way to get such an increase, in my judgment, is to diminish the total for military research. We could also give the taxpayer a dividend of fifty-six million in addition.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. First I should like to continue with my statement, unless the Senator from Wyoming has a pressing question to ask.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I completely share the Senator's desire to increase the appropriation for the National Science Foundation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator share my desire to diminish the appropriation for military research?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I would be very willing to accept the amendment and carry it to conference.

Mr. DOUGLAS. With the understanding I hope that the phrase "carry it to conference" does not have attached to it the usual ambiguous euphemism that it is a substitute for quiet asphyxiation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. This is the second time that the Senator from Illinois has complimented me by indicating that I do not mean what I say.

Mr. DOUGLAS. No. I did not intend to reflect in any way upon the Senator's good faith and intentions, which I know are the most honorable. I was thinking more of the phrase "carry it to conference." We have certain language in the Senate—

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Illinois has never had that experience with the Senator from Wyoming. I am sure he will acknowledge that fact.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have great confidence in the Senator from Wyoming. Does the Senator accept my amendment?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes. Before I do so I wish the Senate to have some information as to precisely what is being done in this research and developing program. I feel it is one of the most important appropriations which can be made. It is true that it is for more than \$1,400,000,000. It is an increase over what it was last year. However, it is producing the new instruments of combat which will save our own men by increasing the protective devices around them.

I want the Senate to know just how it is organized. I requested Mr. Walter G. Whitman, the Chairman of the Research and Development Board, to send me a memorandum, to be inserted in the RECORD, showing certain information. The memorandum I have in my hand shows the membership of the Research and Development Board, the key personnel, the chairmen of the various committees, and a list of the consultants to the Board. It gives information from the Army regarding research and development, information from the Air Force, and a description of how the Board operates. I desire to insert the information at this point in the RECORD. I particularly want the Senate to understand that there is a national policy group within the Research and Development Board, which works with the chairman in formulating policy, and that this group includes some of the most distinguished scientists and educators in the country. The memoran-

dum also gives a brief description of each of these gentlemen.

I ask unanimous consent that the memorandum may be inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT BOARD MEMBERS

Walter G. Whitman, Chairman; Dr. James A. Perkins, Deputy Chairman.

Hon. Archibald S. Alexander, Under Secretary of the Army; Lt. Gen. T. B. Larkin, United States Army, Assistant Chief of Staff, G-4, deputy.

Maj. Gen. Ward H. Maris, Deputy Assistant Chief of Staff, G-4, for Research and Development; Maj. Gen. Rex W. Beasley, Assistant Chief, Research and Development Section, AFF, Fort Monroe, Va., deputy.

Hon. Dan A. Kimball, Secretary of the Navy; Rear Adm. C. M. Bolster, United States Navy, Deputy and Assistant Chief of Naval Research, deputy.

Rear Adm. Maurice Edwin Curts, United States Navy, Assistant Chief of Naval Operations, Readiness; Rear Adm. M. F. Schoeffel, United States Navy, Chief of Naval Research, deputy.

Hon. John A. McCone, Under Secretary of the Air Force; William A. M. Burden, Special Assistant to Secretary of the Air Force, deputy.

Maj. Gen. Donald L. Putt, United States Air Force, Acting Deputy Chief of Staff, Development; Brig. Gen. Donald N. Yates, United States Air Force, Director of Research and Development, Deputy Chief of Staff, Development, deputy.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT BOARD POLICY GROUP

An internal policy group within the Research and Development Board works closely with the Chairman in formulating and executing policy, with special emphasis on utilizing the talents of the many scientists and engineers from industry and the universities who are assisting the Board in its work.

The internal policy group includes Dr. James A. Perkins as Deputy Chairman, Dr. Robert C. Gunness and Mr. Edwin A. Speakman as Vice Chairmen, Dr. S. Douglas Cornell as Director of Planning, and the three full-time military secretaries of the Board, Brig. Gen. Robert W. Crichlow of the Army, Capt. Steadman Teiler of the Navy, and Col. Merrill B. Burnside of the Air Force.

Walter G. Whitman, the Chairman, came to the Research and Development Board from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, where he was head of the department of chemical engineering. His experience includes 9 years in industrial research before coming to MIT in 1934. During the war he was in charge of the Basic Chemical Division of the War Production Board and Chairman of the Committee on Aviation Fuels of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics. In 1948 he directed a study of nuclear-powered aircraft for the Atomic Energy Commission, and he was appointed to the AEC's General Advisory Committee last year.

Dr. James A. Perkins, the Deputy Chairman, received his Bachelor of Arts degree from Swarthmore College in 1934 and his Doctor of Philosophy degree from Princeton in 1937.

From 1937 to 1941 Dr. Perkins was assistant professor of public affairs and assistant director, School of Public and International Affairs, at Princeton University. In 1941 he joined the Office of Price Administration in Washington, D. C., as Director of the Paper Division. In 1943 he became Assistant to the Administrator of the Foreign Economic Administration. In 1945 he left the Government to become vice president of Swarth-

more College, a position he held until 1950, when he became executive associate of the Carnegie Corp. of New York.

Dr. Robert C. Gunness, one of the two vice chairmen, received his bachelor of science degree in chemistry in 1932 at Massachusetts State College and his doctorate in Chemical engineering at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in 1936. After serving as assistant professor at MIT, he joined the research department of the Standard Oil Co. of Indiana, engaging initially in process design and pilot-plant development of petroleum and petrochemical processes. Since 1947 he has been manager of the company's research activities. Dr. Gunness is a councilor of the American Institute of Chemical Engineers. He contributes to the board a broad experience and talent in the field of chemical engineering and in the management of industrial research.

Mr. Edwin A. Speakman, the other vice chairman, received his bachelor of science degree in physics from Haverford College in 1926. From 1931 to 1934 Mr. Speakman was instructor in physics at Haverford, where he invented the first system which used a light beam for timing races automatically and to an accuracy of 0.01 second. In 1934, Mr. Speakman joined the research laboratories of the Philco Corp. as a radio engineer. Here he invented the telescopic rod antenna which has been adopted for use on all radio-equipped automobiles. In 1939, Mr. Speakman went with the Naval Research Laboratory as assistant superintendent of the radio division, and headed the countermeasures branch of the Laboratory from 1940 to 1949. During this period he also initiated developments for naval radar equipment.

RDB COMMITTEE CHAIRMEN

1. Committee on Aeronautics: Philip B. Taylor, Sanderson & Porter, New York, N. Y.
2. Committee on Atomic Energy: Dr. Robert F. Bacher, Norman Bridge Laboratory of Physics, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, Calif.
3. Committee on Biological Warfare: Dr. Ira L. Baldwin, vice president, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.
4. Committee on Chemical Warfare: Dr. R. C. Swain, vice president, American Cyanamid Co., New York, N. Y.
5. Committee on Electronics: Mr. D. A. Quarles, vice president, Bell Telephone Laboratories, New York, N. Y.
6. Committee on Equipment and Materials: Dr. Lawrence W. Bass, vice president, U. S. Industrial Chemicals Corp., Chicago, Ill.
7. Committee on Fuels and Lubricants: Mr. William M. Holaday, director, Socony Vacuum Laboratories, New York, N. Y.
8. Committee on Geophysics and Geography: Dr. W. E. Wrather, Director Geological Survey, United States Department of Interior, Washington, D. C.
9. Committee on Guided Missiles: Dr. Clark B. Millikan, Guggenheim Aeronautical Laboratory, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, Calif.
10. Committee on Human Resources: Dr. Frank A. Geldard, department of psychology, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Va.
11. Committee on Medical Sciences: Dr. Lowell T. Coggeshall, University of Chicago, department of medicine, Chicago, Ill.
12. Committee on Ordnance: Dr. J. A. Hutcheson, Westinghouse Electric Corp., East Pittsburgh, Pa.

RDB CONSULTANTS

Dr. Caryl P. Haskins, director, Haskins Laboratory, Inc; Dr. Alfred L. Loomis, president, Loomis Institute of Scientific Research; Karl T. Keller, president, Chrysler Corp.; Dr. Mervin J. Kelly, executive vice president, Bell Telephone Laboratory; Dr. Robert F. Bacher, chairman, department of

physics, California Institute of Technology; Dr. Ira L. Baldwin, vice president, University of Wisconsin; Dr. Julius A. Stratton, provost, MIT; Dr. James P. Baxter, III, president, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass.; Dr. Lee A. DuBridge, president, California Institute of Technology; Dr. Merle T. Tuve, director, department of terrestrial magnetism, Carnegie Institute of Washington; Dr. Lloyd V. Berkner, staff member, department of terrestrial magnetism, Carnegie Institution of Washington; Mr. Robert E. Wilson, chairman of board, Standard Oil Co. of Indiana; Dr. D. W. Bronk, president and professor of biophysics, Johns Hopkins University; Dr. Vannevar Bush, president, Carnegie Institution of Washington; Dr. L. T. Coggeshall, dean, division of biological sciences, University of Chicago; Dr. Karl T. Compton, chairman of the corporation, MIT; Dr. James B. Conant, president, Harvard University; Dr. Frederick L. Hovde, president, Purdue University; Dr. James B. Macelwane, S. J., dean, Institute of Technology, St. Louis University; Dr. Donald S. Marquis, chairman, department of psychology, University of Michigan; Dr. Clark B. Millikan, director, Daniel Guggenheim Aeronautical Laboratory, California Institute of Technology; Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer, director, professor of physics, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, N. J.; Dr. I. I. Rabi, professor of physics, Columbia University; Dr. Irvin Stewart, president, University of West Virginia; Dr. John Von Neumann, research professor of mathematics, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, N. J.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Do I understand that the Senator from Wyoming has accepted the amendment?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have accepted it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. With the understanding that this cut of \$70,000,000 will be applied by the Research and Development Board?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the gracious Senator from Wyoming for making possible this great progress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I call up my amendment 9-10-51-M.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 71, between lines 10 and 11, it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. —. No part of any appropriations made by this act shall be available to reimburse any person for expenses of travel in any amount in excess of the amount of the expenses actually incurred by such person in such travel.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, this amendment is designed to correct another abuse in the armed services. It would correct the abuse in the field of issuing orders to temporary duty for members of the armed services. I should like to explain the background on which the amendment is based.

During the last war in the Pacific it was virtually impossible for any officer or enlisted man, who was sent from one station to another, to incur any significant expense. He would be housed either at an officers' or enlisted men's quarters.

His meals would also be furnished free. There was no actual expense incurred in the course of the travel. Nevertheless it was the general practice of adjutants to issue temporary duty orders, under which the then prevailing rate of \$6 per day expense would be paid. This practice provided an amount of "gravy" which was somewhat similar in nature to the flight pay "gravy," which we have now largely eliminated.

The Senator from Illinois had some experience with this situation, because for some time he served as the adjutant of a Marine Corps division in the Pacific. Without being forward or attempting to compliment myself unduly, I do take a certain amount of pride in the fact that I always refused to issue orders which involved payment of travel allowance in areas in which no expense was incurred.

I wish to pay great tribute to the Chiefs of Staff and commanding generals under whom I served, for supporting me most vigorously in the position which I took. However, it was the general practice throughout the Pacific to allow \$6 a day for travel expenses on assignments to temporary duty. The per diem allowance has now been increased to \$9 a day. I once made an estimate that probably from \$5,000,000 to \$10,000,000 had been wasted in the Pacific area alone on these per diem allowances, for which expenses were not incurred. It is not certain how much of a saving the present amendment would bring about, but if we were to have hostilities continued in isolated areas of the world, where there are no hotels and where no out-of-pocket expenses are incurred, it would amount to a real saving. I hope the chairman of the subcommittee will accept the amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. This is another amendment which is subject to the same criticism I made of the previous amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois. His amendment with respect to flight pay was based, in my opinion, wholly upon conditions which have ceased to exist, as was clearly exemplified when the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], in response to my inquiry, said that he was giving testimony of conditions which existed prior to the passage of the act of October 12, 1949.

The Senator from Illinois, in speaking of his experience in the Pacific, is referring to a condition which existed before the Korea Compensation Act of 1949 was passed. This act fixes the maximum per diem rate for military personnel traveling within the United States at \$9, the same as is paid to civilian employees. It is incorporated in the regulations known as General Travel Regulations for the Uniformed Services. The regulations apply to all the services—Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Air Force, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service. In the administration of this item protection from abuse is provided by the following methods:

First. Deductions when Government quarters are furnished.

Second. Deductions when Government messing facilities are available.

Third. No per diem when both quarters and messing facilities are available.

Fourth. A lesser per diem, subject to the above deductions when the duty period involved is of an extended nature.

Fifth. No per diem at all when the nature of the duty is such as to preclude the necessity for a per diem, such as short trips not requiring overnight lodging.

Mr. President, the evidence presented indicated to me that the per diem system has been found to be administratively much more efficient than either the mileage or the actual expense system.

I had a memorandum on that matter prepared. The contention seemed to be that if we were to require the actual-expense-allowance method, it would be necessary to employ a much larger staff than now is necessary for administrative purposes.

The memorandum designates this method as impracticable, if not impossible, as an administrative problem, and states that the payment of travel allowances on a voucherable basis would necessarily require the procuring of receipts for each expense incurred in connection therewith; for example, receipts would have to be obtained for meals, tips, lodging, and so forth.

The cost of such a method would far exceed the present cost of the method of payment on a per diem basis.

In the memorandum there are numerous other items. I shall not bother to read them to the Senate, but I now ask unanimous consent to have the entire memorandum printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The suggestion that the payment of travel allowances on a per diem basis be abolished would result in an impracticable, if not impossible, administrative problem for the following reasons:

1. The payment of travel allowances on a voucherable basis would necessarily require the procuring of receipts for each expense incurred in connection therewith. Examples of items for which receipts would be necessary are meals, tips, lodging, etc.

2. The additional administrative costs entailed by the payment of travel allowances on a voucherable or actual expense basis would far exceed the present cost of payment of per diem.

3. Payment of travel allowances on a voucherable basis would not provide sufficient data on which to base budget estimates.

4. Current statutory authorization limits the payment for expenses in connection with lodgings, subsistence, and necessary incidental expenses, to a maximum of \$9 a day. This maximum would be eliminated in the event a voucherable basis were substituted therefor. Actual expenses paid would no doubt far exceed the present limitation of \$9.

5. A voucherable system would discourage economical use of hotel and restaurant accommodations.

6. The impracticability of actual expense voucher system for civilian travel was proved to be so unsatisfactory that the law was changed to authorize reimbursement of expenses on a per diem basis.

7. The Bureau of the Budget, apparently recognizing the impracticability of securing receipts for certain items of expenditure for civilians has, effective August 10, 1951, discontinued the requirement of such receipts for expenditures for items not covered by the

per diem in lieu of subsistence where the amount is less than \$3.

The proposed system of reimbursement would impose undue hardship and burden on members of the uniformed services in that they would be placed in a different category for reimbursement purposes from any Government employees or personnel engaged in private enterprise.

9. The requiring of receipts would not appear to be compatible with the standards of conduct required of personnel in uniform.

10. It is considered that, based on current inflated economical standards, a \$9 maximum per diem rate is, in fact, the minimum amount necessary to perform travel.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I express the hope that the amendment will be rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment lettered "M," submitted by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. [Putting the question.]

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. FLANDERS obtained the floor.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield, to permit me to submit an amendment to the pending bill?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to the pending bill, which I ask to lie on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will be received and will lie on the table.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I submit the motion which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion by Mr. FLANDERS: I move that the pending bill, H. R. 5054 (making appropriations for the National Security Council, the National Security Resources Board, and for military functions administered by the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes), be recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions that the committee shall report the bill as soon as reasonably may be in a total sum not to exceed \$55,000,000,000.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I am mindful of the terrific task which this subcommittee has faced, and which indeed is faced by the Appropriations Committee as a whole. No committee of the Senate has a more arduous, time-consuming, and nerve-racking duty than does the Appropriations Committee. I have, therefore, desired to put this motion to recommit in such form that the members of that committee shall not be required, even by implication, again to bring the officials of the Department of Defense before them or to go over material which already has been presented in the testimony, and to which attention already has been given.

I would expect that the committee could in a comparatively short space of time remove from the bill the items

which relate to contractual obligations made by the Government, and which must be met, and then could make proportional decreases in the remainder, so to bring the total to \$55,000,000,000. Should there be any special considerations which would lead to special treatment of any items, the committee, under the motion, can take cognizance of them.

Obviously such a change would serve the purposes of economy, but it has back of it a far more fundamental and important point than the saving of \$5,000,000,000 in connection with a particular measure at this particular time. What is involved, as was said Tuesday, is placing a bar to the further development of the garrison state into which we have entered with a progress that is quiet, unostentatious and almost unregarded, but which to the seeing and comprehending eye is terrifically alarming in these days when we are not engaged in a major conflict. When we are engaged in a major conflict, of course all limits are off.

Unless we can set limits to the demands of the Defense Establishment in these times, it will continue to solidify its present control over our economy, over our standard of living, and over our personal lives.

I am not impugning the motives of the Defense Establishment. I am doing the opposite of that. I am saying that those who head it are high-minded and patriotic. I have not the slightest doubt in my own mind as to the honesty of their conviction that the sums requested are necessary for the safety of the country. Furthermore, I believe they are honest in their statements that what we are facing is a peak load of expenditures to be endured for a short time, and to be followed, if open warfare does not ensue, by a period of lessening burdens.

What I do strongly feel is that there is no logical limit to the demands of a conscientious and patriotic Defense Establishment in times like these. No provision of arms and armament is enough. No expenditures are too great. This must be so in the nature of the case to those who by training and experience place their full faith in armed strength. If the nation places its whole faith in armed strength, it must be prepared to go the limit and to become truly and permanently a garrison state.

This need not be. If our State Department accepts the responsibility of developing the psychological and spiritual forces which lie ready at its hands, the burden of material preparation will be greatly diminished. Military victories may be won by arms alone at a terrific cost in social disorganization and loss of freedom for our people; but that has not in the past, and will not in the future, bring peace. Peace can come only by making allies of the enslaved peoples within the Soviet orbit and bringing into mutual and helpful connections with us all the nations of the earth outside that orbit, who now are properly suspicious of international rivalries which are expressed in terms of military power.

A proper realization on the part of the State Department of its real duties and real possibilities will diminish, although

it will not do away with, the necessity for enormous military expenditures; but it will permit us to escape from this imprisonment in the garrison state whose one-way door we are now entering.

Again I would call the attention of the Senate and of our State Department to the possibilities of such actions as were expressed in my speech on the Senate floor of July 9. I would also again call the attention of the Senate, of the Foreign Relations Committee, and of the State Department to the practical proposals for universal disarmament which were made by 23 members of this body in the resolution introduced on August 20. The latter document is of particular importance in view of the dead certainty that Russia will be making its own drive for peace at the coming Assembly of the United Nations in November. If our resolution is passed and is taken seriously by our State Department, we will be prepared with a constructive answer to such proposals. If not, we will be, as so often hitherto, caught unprepared and off balance.

To sum up the matter, Mr. President, let me say this is an economy proposal to the extent of \$5,000,000,000, although such sums have become a mere bagatelle in these days in which we are living; but it addresses itself fundamentally to such a civilian control on military expenditures as will enable us to escape from a complete but unnecessary domination of our lives by our Military Establishment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] to recommit the bill, with instructions.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, of course I oppose the motion. The committee worked upon this bill for about 12 weeks. As has been stated repeatedly during the debate by members of the committee, the committee not only went over the bill line by line, but also went over the budget estimates line by line.

Every word which the Senator from Vermont has said is accurate enough. Of course the appropriation recommended is a huge one, and I am sure no member of the subcommittee or of the Appropriations Committee would have voted for it except under the compelling conviction that the appropriations contained in the bill are necessary, not only in order to defend the United States, but also in order to preserve the liberties of mankind.

This is a \$61,000,000,000 bill. The figure was raised to \$61,000,000,000 because we added \$5,000,000,000 for the expansion of air power. If we take \$5,000,000,000 out of the bill, we shall be reducing it to \$56,000,000,000. The same argument exactly as the one which the Senator from Vermont makes in support of a reduction of \$5,000,000,000 from a \$61,000,000,000 bill could be made in support of a similar reduction from a \$56,000,000,000 bill. We are dealing in gigantic sums, but we are locked in combat, we are locked in philosophical and ideological conflict with a totalitarian power which, by fiat, can create whatever money it needs, which does not need to pay soldiers or sailors or aviators,

which can force production through the threat of a concentration camp, which can and which does take over the entire industrial system and by force produces the commodities which we are trying to produce in a free system.

We try to maintain the profit incentive. We try to retain the system of free enterprise. But let no one misunderstand the fact: The reductions proposed by the Senator, if they were to be made, would have to be made by curtailing the military power of the United States, while the conflict is mounting. The daily newspapers and the daily dispatches over the radio tell us the story of what is going on. We know that the cease-fire negotiations in Korea have practically broken down. Why? Many people believe that they were instigated by the Soviet totalitarianism solely for the purpose of creating confusion and misunderstanding, and in order to give time to the Communists in which to build up their power.

Are we to risk repudiating the best judgment which the committee has been able to secure? Our committee will not know where to make these cuts. We shall have to call in the military again. We shall have to go over the document page by page and line by line. We could not substitute our judgment for the judgment of the military, whom we have trained to do this job.

Mr. President, I again call the attention of Members of the Senate to the fact that the Department of Defense itself made a cut of more than 40 percent below the requests made by the various divisions of the armed services; and the Bureau of the Budget then made additional cuts. The bill has been scrutinized with the greatest care, and I feel that it would be altogether improper to call upon the committee once more to do a job which it has done in utmost good faith and with great labor and great expenditure of time.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Is it not the function of the committee to pare down every one of these items to the very bare minimum which the committee believes must be granted in order to provide for the various functions?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. LONG. Have the Senator and his committee performed that function in trimming down the items in the bill as closely as they believed the interests of national security would permit?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That statement has been made over and over by members of the committee. As chairman of the committee, I say again that I have worked upon this bill since the 7th day of June, and no one knows better than the Senator from Louisiana that, because of the necessity of devoting my time to this bill, I have been compelled to neglect other legislation in which he and I are very much interested.

Mr. LONG. As a matter of fact, the Senator from Wyoming knows that the junior Senator from Louisiana, at least twice a week, has been asking the chairman of the committee to set aside some

time for the consideration of tidelands legislation by the committee of which he is chairman, and that we have not had an opportunity, for almost a month, to meet with the committee, the reason being that the distinguished chairman of our committee has been working diligently, day and night, on the bill which has been under discussion by the Senate for several days. Does the Senator know of any additional information and knowledge he could expect readily to come to him, if the bill were to be re-committed for further consideration?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I know of none. It would necessarily have to be an arbitrary slash. I hope the Senate will reject the motion to recommit with instructions, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	McKellar
Bennett	Hayden	McMahon
Benton	Hendrickson	Millikin
Brewster	Hennings	Monroney
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Moody
Butler, Md.	Hill	Morse
Butler, Nebr.	Hoey	Mundt
Cain	Holland	Murray
Capehart	Humphrey	Neely
Carlson	Hunt	Nixon
Case	Ives	O'Mahoney
Clements	Jenner	Pastore
Connally	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Cordon	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Dirksen	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Douglas	Kem	Smith, Maine
Dworshak	Kerr	Smith, N. J.
Eastland	Langer	Smith, N. C.
Eaton	Lehman	Stennis
Ellender	Long	Taft
Ferguson	Martin	Thye
Flanders	Maybank	Underwood
Frear	McCarran	Watkins
Fulbright	McCarthy	Welker
George	McClellan	Williams
Gillette	McFarland	Young

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] to recommit the bill, with instructions.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, how much time do I have?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator has 7 minutes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield to me for 1 minute?

Mr. FLANDERS. Out of the Senator's time or out of my time?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. My time is exhausted.

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I merely wish to advise those who have been called to the Senate floor by the quorum call that the issue now is upon the motion to recommit, with instructions to cut \$5,000,000,000 from the bill. I have said to the Senators who were in the Chamber before the quorum call that the committee has labored many long hours and very diligently since the 7th of June on this bill, and it decidedly feels that the motion to recommit should not be agreed to.

I thank the Senator from Vermont for yielding.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I wish to suggest to the Senator from

Wyoming, whose labors and the labors of those fellow members on the subcommittee and on the full committee I tried fully to recognize in my presentation of the motion, that, nevertheless, what is back of my motion is something of fundamental importance which overrides all labors, all difficulties, and all detailed sums. The fundamental question is whether we are going so far in a period when we are not yet in actual warfare that, by the fiscal necessities of military appropriations, we lose our freedom and become a garrison state. That is the question which I think overrides all other considerations, and it was with that thought in mind that I proposed the motion.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a brief question?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Does not the Senator really feel that, in view of the fact that the House Appropriations Committee spent weeks of study and that the Senate committee spent weeks of study on the regular budget for the defense agencies, if we should send the bill back to the committee with instructions to cut out \$5,000,000,000 it would be tantamount to the Senate saying, "We do not want the \$5,000,000,000 for additional air power for which you have no budget estimate"? Would we not put the Senate on record as instructing the committee to cut out the Air arm when the committee thought it was the most essential thing that could be developed?

Mr. FLANDERS. I should like to say, in answer to the question of the distinguished Senator from Virginia, that I would decidedly wish to remove myself personally from that imputation. The suggestion is that proportional cuts be made, in the judgment of the committee, aside from those sums which have to be left as they are because of contractual commitments.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I have been on my feet for some time.

Mr. FLANDERS. If the Senator had piped up I would have had the advantage of the ear as well as of the eye.

Mr. GREEN. I did pipe up. I am sorry I did not pipe up more loudly.

Mr. FLANDERS. Is it a brief question which the Senator has to ask?

Mr. GREEN. It is a brief question. I understood the Senator in his preliminary remarks to draw a distinction between winning by force and winning by spiritual means, and the intimation was that the more money we spend for force the less we can use in other respects. As I understand, the State Department is using spiritual means as well as force to accomplish the ends which the Nation has in view. Why should we use any more spiritual force if we cut down the appropriation for military purposes?

Mr. FLANDERS. My statement was not quite as the Senator from Rhode

Island has indicated. I shall have to be brief in my answer, in justice to the Senator from Illinois. My statement was that complete dependence on military force leads to limitless expenditures.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President—

Mr. FLANDERS. If the Senator from Rhode Island will excuse me, in justice to the Senator from Illinois, I must yield my remaining time to him.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, how much time have I available?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Vermont has the floor. Unless the Senator from Vermont yields to the Senator from Illinois for the purpose of addressing the Senate, he can yield only for interrogatories.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I yield the time remaining to me to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, how much time do I have?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Three minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I intend to support the motion of the Senator from Vermont for a number of reasons. In the first place, I recall that at the end of World War II, when it came time to rescind military appropriations, we really discovered the acceleration, we really discovered the pace at which money can actually be expended.

No one, of course, is unmindful of the jeopardy which confronts the country. No one is unmindful of the task we face. Yet it seems to me we are dealing here with such astronomical amounts that they represent a kind of financial indigestion to the country, and I for one do not believe that the vast amounts of money carried by this bill can be effectively spent in a short space of time. It should not be forgotten, of course, that Congress is coming back on the third day of January. If there are holes, if there are gaps, those can certainly be repaired at the right time.

Mr. President, there have appeared in the newspapers from time to time statements emanating from committees of the United States Senate as to the lag in our production program. It is only within the last 3 or 4 days that there was published an Associated Press dispatch to the effect that we were nearly 6 months behind in the aircraft program, if I remember correctly. I am distressed over the fact that I did not save the clipping. If that be true, why they the push, what is the super-urgency? Congress will be back in January.

Finally, Mr. President, I think I ought to point out that in the humble judgment of the junior Senator from Illinois there is one thing that we often overlook, and that is one of the great elements of strength which is required of us by the tour de force with which we are confronted at the present time. I refer to strength at home. I am not persuaded that a few symbolic divisions either on the Elbe, the Oder, or the Weser River in Germany are going to frighten Josef Stalin. The thing that is going to frighten Josef Stalin, the

thing that is going to make him count his pennies twice, the thing that is going to set him back on his heels, is a proper regard for the vitality of America at home. If he expects to win at all he will have to win with a blitz and he knows full well that if he did not follow that course a vitally strong, resilient and robust America at home would cook his goose before he got through.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I cannot yield. I have only limited time. I hope my friend from Virginia will pardon me for not yielding.

A couple of days ago a former presiding officer of this body, Hon. Charles Dawes, passed away in Chicago. Shortly before he passed away, he said to a friend of mine, "Even a country so big, so large, so fat, and so wealthy as the United States of America could one day run out of credit and go into insolvency."

Mr. President, I think we must have a proper regard for our country's credit. We must manifest an alertness in the legislative branch and say to our military leaders, "Look, we, too, are mindful of the best purpose for which this money can be effectively spent. We are interested in the things in which you are interested, but at the same time it becomes the solemn responsibility of the legislative branch to make sure that the strength and the force and the vitality of America on the home front are not impaired."

What we do here could be one of the most salutary things for the strength of America that I can think of.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

The question is on the motion made by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] to recommit the bill, with instructions.

Mr. FLANDERS and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] is unavoidably detained on official business at one of the Government departments.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATH-

ERS], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] would each vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] is absent by leave of the Senate, and, if present, he would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] and the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] are detained on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY]. If present and voting, the Senator from California would vote "nay" and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 29, nays 49, as follows:

YEAS—29

Aiken	Flanders	Millikin
Bennett	Frear	Schoeppel
Brewster	George	Smith, Maine
Bricker	Hendrickson	Smith, N. J.
Butler, Md.	Hickenlooper	Smith, N. C.
Butler, Nebr.	Jenner	Taft
Capehart	Johnson, Colo.	Watkins
Dirksen	Kern	Welker
Dworshak	Langer	Williams
Ferguson	Martin	

NAYS—49

Benton	Hoey	Monroney
Cain	Holland	Moody
Carlson	Humphrey	Morse
Case	Hunt	Mundt
Clements	Ives	Murray
Connally	Johnson, Tex.	Neely
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Nixon
Douglas	Kerr	O'Mahoney
Eastland	Lehman	Pastore
Eaton	Long	Robertson
Ellender	Maybank	Saltonstall
Fulbright	McCarran	Stennis
Gillette	McCarthy	Thye
Green	McClellan	Underwood
Hayden	McFarland	Young
Hennings	McKellar	
Hill	McMahon	

NOT VOTING—18

Anderson	Kilgore	Russell
Bridges	Knowland	Smathers
Byrd	Lodge	Sparkman
Chavez	Magnuson	Tobey
Duff	Malone	Wherry
Kefauver	O'Connor	Wiley

So Mr. FLANDERS' motion to recommit, with instructions, was rejected.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I send to the desk a motion and ask that it be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

MOTION BY Mr. LANGER To RECOMMIT
H. R. 5054

Mr. President, I move that the pending bill (H. R. 5054) making appropriations for the National Security Council, the National Security Resources Board, and for military functions administered by the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, be recommitment to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions that the committee shall report the bill as soon as reasonably may be in a total sum not to exceed \$56,000,000,000.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I yield the entire 15 minutes to my colleague from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I doubt whether I shall need all the time. I should like to ask the Senator from Wyoming a question. I should like to know what the net of unexpended balances is for all purposes under this bill, or for similar purposes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That information was set forth in the report.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The question was discussed earlier in the week. I now read from the report:

The latest figures available to the committee show that there is now available for expenditure in the Department of Defense, \$36,004,000,000 heretofore appropriated. This is divided among the three services as follows:

Army	\$13,272,000,000
Navy	7,319,000,000
Air Force	15,413,000,000

The latest estimate of actual cash expenditures during fiscal year 1952 is \$39,284,000,000, which, in turn, is divided among the three services as follows:

Army	\$14,959,000,000
Navy	11,550,000,000
Air Force	12,775,000,000

I should add that in dividing the appropriations for procurement into two categories, for expenditure in 1952 and expenditure in 1953, it was desired to indicate that because many of the major procurement items cannot be constructed in a single year, the money cannot be expended.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I think every Member of the Senate is fully aware that these items must run over into the succeeding year. However, the essential fact remains that there are \$34,000,000,000 in unexpended balances. We have before us a bill providing another \$36,000,000,000 for 1952 and \$27,000,000,000 for 1953. If that amount cannot give this country financial indigestion, then I do not know what money really means.

All the reports which we get indicate the lag, and along with it arises, so far as procurement is concerned, the fine question whether or not today we have the kind of unified effort and coordinated activity which does not impel the Congress to put on the brakes.

I have before me the preparedness report of the Armed Services Committee with respect to tungsten. This report is dated July 5. I read from the report:

Here were two agencies—the Munitions Board and the Department of the Army. Each was the child of a parent organization—the Nation's Defense Establishment. Each had an important defense responsibility involving a vital metal—tungsten. Each had the clear obligation to work together for the national security.

Yet, though both were housed in the same building, these two agencies, so far as tungsten problems were concerned, acted as though they had never been introduced. They might as well have been separated by impenetrable barriers and thousands of miles, instead of thin partitions and a few steps down a corridor.

That is a fine statement to make. That statement was made only a few months ago. It indicates that there is something wanting and something to be desired before we can have a very effective expenditure of these colossal sums.

I have before me another report. This one relates to rubber. It also comes from the Preparedness Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee. It is dated September 4, only a few days ago. I read:

Our first two reports dealt with the rubber situation and they were discouraging reports. They were discouraging because our investigations had disclosed discouraging facts. We had found Government officials whose attitude could best be described as "siesta psychology" and whose idea of rubber preparedness could best be spelled as "paperwork preparedness." We found leaders that wouldn't lead; experts that wouldn't expedite; expeditors that wouldn't expedite. In short, we found just about everything except a determined, intelligent rubber program.

How long is this going to last? Are we going to continue to appropriate billions upon billions, which everyone who has familiarity with procurement and expenditure of money knows cannot be effectively expended in a short time?

Congress will be back in session on the 3d of January. It is not very difficult for the Congress to wheel into action to fill the gaps by deficiency and supplemental appropriations, and to provide what is needed. If the pending bill were limited to an amount which would be \$4,000,000,000 less than the amount which has been recommended by the committee it would certainly be ample for all purposes for 1952 and 1953.

I merely wish to reaffirm what I said before. I am not insensible of the fact that this country must have the best weapons in the world, that it must have superiority on land and sea and in the air, and that it must have fire power which is superior to anything in the world. I believe we can have it. However, I reaffirm over and over again that when the strength, the solvency, and the vitality of America are in the slightest degree impaired, we had better beware, because those are after all, the greatest elements of strength of our country at a time like this.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. LONG. After all, must not what we do depend in a large measure upon what our potential enemy is doing at this time?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The question is: What is our potential enemy doing?

Mr. LONG. Is the Senator speaking of his own knowledge, or is he guessing, when he proposes a \$5,000,000,000 cut?

Mr. DIRKSEN. If the secrecy enforced over there is as close as it has been reported to be, there is no person, either in or out of uniform, who has any adequate knowledge of what they may be doing. Our immediate concern is to provide adequate security and to reaffirm our program. At the same time we must make sure that we are not weakened on the home front. In my

judgment it is far more important to maintain our strength on the home front than to do almost anything else.

There is such a thing as putting a country into a strait-jacket and thus de-vitalizing the spirit and will of a people. That is one of the things that is wrong with the people in Europe. We can send them tanks, equipment of all sorts, combat vehicles, planes, rifles, munitions, and all manner of military supplies, but unless the soldier in whose care a weapon is committed has the spirit and the will and the determination to use it, and use it intelligently, he is only half a soldier at best. I want to make sure that that indispensable and priceless ingredient, which is the safety of America, is not modified or impaired.

After all, it is necessary to preserve the capacity of our country. What is its capacity? I do not know that it can be expressed in dollars. I believe it is one of those rare and indefinable things which is psychological in nature. If we go beyond it we do something that diminishes the effectiveness of our people in a crisis.

Some years ago, when I served on the House Committee on Banking and Currency, Marriner Eccles appeared before our committee. It was at a time when the well known White House spokesman came out with the statement that this country could endure a debt of \$155,000,000,000 and take such a debt in its stride. I recall asking Mr. Eccles: "What is the limit of our debt?"

He said, "I don't know. It can't be expressed in money, but it is that point where people finally begin to put their money in nylon hose and hide it under the Beautyrest mattress, when bond redemptions exceed the amount of bond sales, and when the fiscal solidarity and the financial structure of our country begin to show signs of weakness and disintegration." What else matters? Then we are on the way toward a kind of totalitarian strait-jacket in our own country. It means that every other value disappears.

I remember the story that Lincoln used to tell about two men in Quincy, Ill., one wintertime who got into a brawl. They were wearing overcoats, and they fought so long and brawled so vigorously that they finally brawled into each other's overcoat.

Is that going to be the end of World War II? Is that going to be the end of the business in Korea? Are we going to put the United States of America into a strait-jacket? That would have a deleterious effect, to say the least, upon the spirit, confidence, verve, and push of our people.

I believe this bill can very well stand a cut of \$4,000,000,000—yes, even \$5,000,000,000—below the present levels shown in the bill.

As I said yesterday, there is nothing sacred about a military figure. I used to serve on a deficiency subcommittee. I will tell the Senate how important military figures are. When we concluded consideration of one military bill in committee a budget officer of one of the services came to the subcommittee and said to me, "Mr. Chairman, if you don't tell

anybody, you can take \$150,000,000 out of the ship and shore estimate in the Navy appropriation, and they will never miss it. There is a lot of guesswork about those figures." I am not too deeply impressed that there is anything sacred about the military figures.

I would not for a moment demean the diligent work which has been done by the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, but I would point out again, as I did yesterday—and it has not been controverted—that there is no staff, no expert accountant, or anyone else, who can labor day after day in the service establishments and undertake to monitor the estimates on appropriations, so as to be able to indicate firmly, precisely, and persuasively whether or not the estimates are reliable and sound estimates.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. LONG. In view of the fact that at the present time we know that our potential enemy has a far greater and stronger army and much more equipment, and a far larger air force, with much more effective equipment, does the Senator from Illinois believe that this is the appropriate time in which to cut our national defense budget by 10 percent?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The amount of money appropriated by Congress is no measure of our security. Our security comes when we get men in uniform, equipped with adequate and proper weapons, which are the finest in the world. Those weapons come only when the facilities, the machine tools, and all the necessary equipment are available and coordinated to produce them. A dollar is not a fighting dollar until it is translated into terms of weapons.

If there is anything to the reports we have seen to the effect that there is a lag here and a lag there, it is just as sure as the sun sets in the west that the money provided in the bill cannot be expended within the time allocated. The Senate will return in a few months, and we can take care of all the needs which may be manifested at that time. I believe that a reduction in the appropriation at this time would give heart to the American people. I believe they would say that there are some elected Representatives in the Senate and House of Representatives who are mindful of the interests of the people, and who realize that either fat must be cut or the country will be sent down the disaster road.

I shall vote in favor of the reduction because I believe it is in the interest of the moral, spiritual, and physical strength of our country.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. One minute.

Mr. LANGER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the same arguments which were made against the motion of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] apply to the pending motion.

I believe it ought to be pointed out that a substantial portion of this budget, perhaps more than 50 percent of it, is for the support of the military force which we are raising. We are asking to maintain the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force, and we are asking for an expanded Air Force. The expenditures to support the military personnel will come out of this bill. A reduction of \$4,000,000,000, which is a very large reduction, would require a cut in the subsistence of the Army, Air Force, and Navy, a cut in the expenditures for clothing, and so forth, and a curtailment in the appropriations for the operation and maintenance of various establishments.

For example, consider the Navy: The determination by the Department of Defense, approved by the House of Representatives and approved by the Senate committee, has been that we would wish to maintain 1,162 vessels. The money provided by this bill is intended to do that very thing.

However, in the bill practically 49 percent of the appropriations are for major procurement and production costs for aircraft, ships and harbor craft, and other craft.

The military personnel costs, which in 1950 constituted 35 percent of the total expenditures that year, now constitute only 17 percent; but it will be impossible to go through this bill as directed by the motion without shaving the expenditures for these essential purposes of day-to-day, week-to-week, and month-to-month expenditures by the armed services.

The committee has devoted all the energy and ability it possesses to a survey of these expenditures. The bill was reported unanimously by the Appropriations Committee. In the committee there was no division except upon one item, which was a very small one, amounting to less than \$1,500,000.

Mr. President, your committee has done the very best it possibly could do on this bill.

Therefore, I hope the motion to recommit, like the previous motion to recommit, will be rejected.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield 2 or 3 minutes to me?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes, indeed; I am very glad to do so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I am generally in accord with the views of the distinguished Members of the Senate who have advocated economy, but I cannot go along with their proposals regarding this bill.

We are in a precarious situation internationally. Our security is gravely endangered. Any discussion at this time of how we came to be in that precarious and tragic situation will serve no good purpose. Suffice it to say that we are in that situation.

This bill will provide the new implements for the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force which are needed for our defense.

When we entered World War I and when we entered World War II we had

obsolete equipment and we were entirely unprepared. I hope that situation will not prevail again.

We are now in a war. No one knows at what month or what day we shall be engaged again in a world-wide conflict.

For that reason, Mr. President, I cannot go along with a motion to make unreasonably large cuts in this appropriation bill at it now stands in this our first line of defense.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] to recommit the bill, with certain instructions. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONNOR], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] is unavoidably detained on official business at one of the Government departments.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONNOR], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] would each vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] is absent by leave of the Senate. If present, he would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] is detained on official business.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Washington would vote "nay" and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 29, nays 51, as follows:

YEAS—29

Aiken	Flanders	Millikin
Bennett	Frear	Scheppe
Brewster	George	Smith, Maine
Bricker	Hendrickson	Smith, N. J.
Butler, Md.	Hickenlooper	Smith, N. C.
Butler, Nebr.	Jenner	Taft
Capelhart	Johnson, Colo.	Watkins
Dirksen	Kem	Welker
Dworshak	Langer	Williams
Ferguson	Martin	

NAYS—51

Benton	Hoey	Monroney
Carlson	Holland	Moody
Case	Hunt	Morse
Clements	Ives	Mundt
Connally	Johnson, Tex.	Murray
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Neely
Douglas	Kerr	Nixon
Duff	Knowland	O'Mahoney
Eastland	Lehman	Pastore
Ecton	Long	Robertson
Ellender	Maybank	Russell
Fulbright	McCarran	Saltonstall
Gillette	McCarthy	Smathers
Green	McClellan	Stennis
Hayden	McFarland	Thye
Hennings	McKellar	Underwood
Hill	McMahon	Young

NOT VOTING—16

Anderson	Kefauver	Sparkman
Bridges	Kilgore	Tobey
Byrd	Lodge	Wherry
Cain	Magnuson	Wiley
Chavez	Malone	
Humphrey	O'Connor	

So Mr. LANGER's motion to recommit, with instructions, was rejected.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask that the amendment I have drawn be read by the clerk, and I should like to announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], join me in offering the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 71, between lines 10 and 11, it is proposed to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 633. Appropriations made by this act for fiscal year 1952, and appropriations made by this act for fiscal year 1953, shall each, without impairing national defense, be reduced by an amount equal to 2½ percent of the total amount of such appropriations.

On page 71, line 11, strike out "SEC. 633." and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 634."

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, in offering this amendment, I am following the precedent set in the Committee on Foreign Relations when we felt that because of the fiscal difficulties of our country we had to reduce the foreign aid bill. In that case we reduced the military item by 5 percent. In this case we are asking a reduction in this bill of only 2½ percent.

I feel that as the amendment is worded, with a leeway provided as to where the different adjustments can be made—and under the broad terms of the amendment—they can be made by the Department of Defense—the military could stand a cut of this kind without in any way affecting our security program.

Let me call attention also to the fact that the bill refers to a 2-year period, and the 2½ percent cut can be spread over 2 years. It seems to me that this saving is justified, particularly in view of the fact that leeway is given in making the various cuts. I might say the saying, as we figure it, would amount to about \$1,500,000,000.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator's amendment provide for cutting all the different items an equal percentage?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. No. It provides that the total of the appropriations made in the bill for each of the two respective years shall be reduced by an aggregate amount equal to 2½ percent of that total. So it is not an across-the-board reduction.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to ask the Senator another question. He says his amendment would save a billion and a half dollars. I wonder whether the Senator has heard the report that the \$5,000,000,000 emergency fund, which, I understand, was approved a couple of days ago without question, was not budgeted, and not asked for by the President at this time.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. That is true.

Mr. AIKEN. Why in the world is there a \$5,000,000,000 item in the pending bill for which the President did not ask at all, if the reports are true, but which the committee decided it would allow whether the administration was ready for it or not? It seems to me it would be more in order to postpone the appropriation of that \$5,000,000,000 at this time than it is to chip away a few dollars here and a few dollars somewhere else on all the different items.

Mr. President, I understand the \$5,000,000,000 appropriation to which I have referred was not budgeted. The National Guard had anticipated there would be an item in this bill amounting to \$2,900,000 to provide for additional administrative and custodial expenses of the National Guard. That item was not in the bill, and when I made inquiry of the chairman of the subcommittee I was advised it was left out of the bill because it was not budgeted. Why should we leave out an item of \$2,900,000 because it was not budgeted, but include a \$5,000,000,000 item which was not budgeted? I should like to have that question answered and have an explanation. It seems to me we should not anticipate what the administration is going to ask for some months in the future, and insist upon making an appropriation of \$5,000,000,000 unless it is asked for at this time, because heaven knows the armed services are not bashful about asking for what they want.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I may say, in answer to the Senator from Vermont, that that question should probably be addressed to the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. AIKEN. I know that.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. But the motion recently made by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and the motion made by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] both contemplated sending the bill back to the committee to consider just the kind of matters which the Senator is suggesting. Both motions were defeated. The motion of the Senator from Vermont making a cut of \$6,000,000,000 and the motion of the Senator from North Dakota making a cut of \$5,000,000,000 were both defeated, as I have said. We are asking simply for a 2½-percent cut.

Mr. AIKEN. The appropriation of \$5,000,000,000 was approved, as I understand, day before yesterday, without any

questioning at all on the floor. It seems to me the only way to eliminate \$5,000,000,000, which is a lot of money, which may not be needed for some months, or may not be requested for some months, is to recommit the bill with instructions to cut \$5,000,000,000 from its total. I think that would be logical.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. But we have just had two yea-and-nay votes, and both motions were defeated. I voted for both proposals, one being made by the Senator from Vermont and the other by the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. AIKEN. The reason why I did not bring this matter up when the yea-and-nay votes were taken was that I did not know the item had been approved by the Senate a couple of days ago when there were hardly any Senators on the floor.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I think the Senator's statement is in order.

I now yield to the Senator from South Dakota, because he has joined me in presenting this suggestion for a 2½-percent reduction.

How much time do I have left, Mr. President?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator has 10 minutes left.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Dakota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I am happy to join with the Senator from New Jersey in offering this amendment and if it carries I will not call up the amendment which I introduced a few days ago proposing a 1-percent cut. I called it a "penny-pinching amendment," because it proposed to save 1 cent out of each dollar in the bill. I introduced it purposely to bring out the size of the funds involved.

The bill carries over \$61,000,000,000. One-percent reduction, one penny saved out of each dollar, would amount to \$611,000,000. That is practically the size of the total appropriation for civil functions of the Army, the rivers and harbors bill. When we deal in big figures and go into the billions of dollars, it is staggering what a small percentage saving will mean. The 2½-percent cut, as proposed, should save approximately a billion and a half dollars.

Mr. President, I have great respect for anyone who works on an appropriation bill and sits through hearings, day after day and week after week. And I thought the Senator from Wyoming was rather modest a day or two ago when he said, "Who am I to question the judgment of an admiral?" After all, the distinguished Senator is chairman of the Joint Economic Committee and does have an intimate knowledge of the Nation's economic capacity.

For, Mr. President, while a Member of Congress may hesitate to say how many ships or airplanes are needed for a mission, there is one responsibility which rests upon every Member of the Congress, and that is to share in determining how much of the national income shall

be taken in taxes or mortgaged and applied to any particular purpose.

This point, Mr. President, was most forcefully brought to my attention a few years ago by the then Chief of Staff of the United States Army, General Dwight D. Eisenhower. It was the first time he appeared before the House Appropriations Committee as Chief of Staff. At the conclusion of the hearings he leaned back in his chair and said: "Mr. Chairman, there is one thing I want to say to this subcommittee. We have asked you for what we think is needed. We will defend the same estimates before the Senate Appropriations Committee. But I want you to know that I believe in the division of powers under the Constitution. And," General Eisenhower continued, "the Constitution did not place upon the military the responsibility of saying what share of the national economy should go to national defense. It placed that responsibility upon the Congress."

General Eisenhower then went on to say that after both Houses had acted and the Congress had finally spoken there would be no recriminations on the part of the head of any branch of the War Department, or he would see that there was another person in his place the next morning. Mr. President, the remarks were impromptu and I do not think they appear in the printed hearings of that year, but I took occasion to quote them on the floor of the House sometime later.

Mr. President, we cannot escape our responsibility. We have the responsibility of saying what share of the national economy shall go to the national defense. We have before us a bill carrying over \$61,000,000,000. With the other things which contribute to that purpose, funds for merchant ships and the Maritime Commission, funds for the Atomic Energy Commission, military aid for other countries and so forth, the Congress is probably appropriating upward of \$80,000,000,000 for defense purposes.

I believe the 2½-percent reduction which has been suggested on this bill can be made without impairing national defense. It is a workable amendment. The words used by the Senator from New Jersey do not say that the cut must be applied to the appropriation for every heading but leave to the Department of Defense and the National Security Resources Council the making of 2½-percent saving on the over-all total.

When we are dealing with an activity such as national defense and when we are engaged in mortal combat with an enemy, the problem of reducing military appropriations is a difficult one. But this amendment is workable. It can save a billion and a half dollars. It can have a good effect on the agencies concerned. Instead of saying to them that every dollar they ask for will be given and no questions asked, we are saying that national solvency is a part of national security and we expect them to save where they can. It will be much easier to save this money than to raise it by additional levies on the taxpayers.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield first to the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], because he was on his feet first.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, before the amendment was offered by the Senator from New Jersey, I talked with him and with the Senator from South Dakota, who had an amendment which he has just been describing, providing for a 1-percent cut, except for procurement items which are covered by the Renegotiation Act.

I know that there is not a single Member of the Senate who does not feel the burden of these great appropriations. Though we spent days, weeks, and months studying them, the other members of the committee and I would be the last persons in the world to say they should not be further scrutinized. I want the Senate to know that the Appropriations Committee in presenting this bill providing the huge sums which it carries did so only under a compelling sense of duty to support the armed services in the defense of the Nation and the defense of freedom in a war which threatens the very foundations of individual freedom. But because I know these appropriations should be subjected to scrutiny after scrutiny, and since the amendment is put before us in a manner in which it can be taken to conference and reviewed by the conference committee, and inasmuch as the Senator from New Jersey was good enough, at my suggestion, to make a change in his amendment whereby the responsibility is put on the Secretary of Defense, I am willing to take the amendment to conference and see what can be done to make these additional savings.

The Senator from Vermont has raised a question about the expansion of air power. I have a deep feeling of gratitude to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] who offered an amendment for this general purpose which was considered by the committee and which was changed. I should like to have him make such statement as he may care to make about the \$5,000,000,000 appropriation, of which \$500,000,000 is for the fiscal year 1952.

The VICE PRESIDENT. How much time does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from South Carolina.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that, as the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee stated, only \$500,000,000 will be available for fiscal year 1952. After 2 days of hearings, most of which were secret, most of which were off the record, the subcommittee came to the conclusion that if we appropriated a sufficient amount of money to keep the airplane plants in operation and keep the assembly lines moving, it would, in the end, result in savings.

I presented an amendment to the committee providing for contract authority, but the committee changed it because it

did not think the House would go along with it. The committee substituted the words "air power" for the words "Army Air Force", because it would then include the Navy, which, of course, was in my mind at the time.

Mr. President, I hope that the \$500,000,000 for fiscal year 1952, plus the \$4,500,000,000 provided for the future, will not be denied by the Senate simply by reason of the fact that the hearings do not show what Secretary Finletter, of the Air Force, and Under Secretary McCone, and others said. But I can say in no uncertain terms that Secretary Finletter, and Under Secretary McCone and others, recommended what the committee has reported as the way to work out the matter, to the end that we would have a sufficient air force, in keeping with what was recommended by the House, but for which there was not sufficient money provided for the future in order to keep airplane plants in operation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, there are some things which are a little difficult to explain on the floor of the Senate because of the nature of the appropriation. What I mean is that it is possible to give some aid to a potential enemy in connection with an explanation of certain items. But I think it is due to us to explain the \$5,000,000,000 item. That is what I desire to discuss.

Mr. AIKEN. I understand it was not requested by the President, but that the committee made provision for it.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. There are many things for which I vote on the floor of the Senate which are not necessarily requested by the President. I believe it is the duty of the Congress to set up once and for all the airpower of the country.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is the point I desired to make. Even though the President does not approve or ask for a certain provision, Congress may act. While I am not entirely satisfied that the testimony is clear in the record, I wish to indicate what the committee is trying to do. The committee is seeking to give to the Air Force at this time an appropriation sufficiently large to put into effect a program and to enable the Air Force to carry that program into next year, with the prospect—if Congress appropriates for it next year—of carrying it on into the future. I think there is no greater deterrent to the Soviet and its satellites than for them to realize that America is going to build a really powerful Air Force. That is why it appears to me this item is essential.

I have not objected to the \$5,000,000,000 appropriation, because when those in charge of the Air Force program go to the manufacturers of airplanes, if they do not have the \$5,000,000,000 authorization they cannot let contracts. But if the \$5,000,000,000 appropriation is provided, they can this year say to the manufacturers, taking a hypotheti-

cal case, "We have this much money authorized. We want you to build so many B-36's." They can assure the contractors, the manufacturers, that they have the money for that purpose this year and next year. Naturally the contractors cannot build those planes this year. If a contractor is told, "We want you to build one plane this year," he would be obliged to say "I must have so many millions of dollars." But if it can be said to the contractor "We want so many airplanes built this year, and we want so many next year" he can give a much better price, because he then will know that he is going to carry on and make a greater number of planes. That is exactly what this money is for. I feel that we shall not be wasting this money. If I felt for a moment that it would be wasted I would vote against appropriating it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Michigan has expired.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield me another minute?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield another minute to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. It is for the reason I have stated, Mr. President, that I feel it is well to make the appropriation of \$5,000,000,000. The provision must be worded as it is because it must be realized that the House will not go along on any contract authority provision. Coming as I do from the State of Michigan, where there is a bottleneck in the tool industry, I appreciate that this year we cannot have built the number of airplanes we really should have. Therefore, we have to make provision for producing some airplanes this year, with an assurance to the manufacturers that the money is available with which to contract next year for more planes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Michigan has expired.

Mr. MAYBANK. Will the Senator from Wyoming yield so I may ask the Senator from Michigan a question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I promised the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] the opportunity to make a brief statement. How much time have I left?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wyoming has 7 minutes left. The Senator from Wyoming has control of that time. To whom does the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Massachusetts, and I suggest that he also give an opportunity to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] to ask questions he may wish to ask.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I asked the Senator from Wyoming for time to make a brief statement in reply to the Senator from Vermont and I hope the Senator from Vermont will listen to what I have to say.

The Senator from Vermont asked whether the President had recommended this \$5,000,000,000 appropriation. This morning I asked the very same question of the Secretary of the Air Force, Mr. Finletter. While the committee has put this amount in the bill, and the Depart-

ment of the Air Force and the Secretary of Defense have approved it, the Bureau of the Budget has not had an opportunity to pass upon it. I am informed by the Secretary of the Air Force that the item is approved by the President.

Let me say further that the subcommittee was informed that the Department of Defense would come forward in early October or late September, or the first of next year, with a request for substantially the amount the committee has included in the bill, with the idea of making available plants and blueprinting for the Air Force.

I should like to add a few words of a general nature. I am very glad that the Senator from Wyoming has accepted the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey and the Senator from South Dakota, because an enormous amount of money is involved. As a result of that amendment we will have an opportunity to review the appropriations, and we should do so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I now yield a minute to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] to address a question to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], and then I desire to yield to the Senator from Maine, to whom I promised I would yield.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I desired to say to the distinguished Senator from Michigan that this morning we were in session with Mr. Charles Wilson, and he fully explained the necessity for securing machine tools so as to expedite airplane production. He also explained to us what had been done for small business. He made available to us a document which he had presented to the President, and which the President had asked him to make available to the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. President, I wish to say that I appreciate what the Senator from Michigan has said. He well knows that we must take the action now proposed to be taken if we are to build up our airpower. The Senator from Michigan has well stated the situation as it exists with respect to Detroit.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I appreciate what the Senator from South Carolina has said. Mr. Wilson, as he stated, explained the situation to the committee. Time after time it has been urged that greater speed be made in respect to the production of the necessary tools for the building of airplanes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] as I had promised him.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Maine is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President—
Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. How much time has the Senator left?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator has 5 minutes left.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Wyoming for accepting this suggestion. In support of what I think is a well warranted conclusion, I wish to quote from statements made by the one who is now President of the United States, when, as chairman of the War Investigating Committee, he was discussing a very similar problem on the floor of the Senate. He was addressing himself to the question of unexpended balances. The then Senator Truman said, on page 10361 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for December 7, 1943:

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I should like to discuss my viewpoint on this amendment. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] has been acting as chairman of the Appropriations Committee for 2 or 3 years. The Senator from Tennessee will recall that in 1941, when the appropriation bill for 1942 was under consideration, the War Department had an unexpended balance of \$35,-000,000,000.

That is almost precisely what we have now.

I tried my level best to get the Appropriations Committee to find out why that \$35,-000,000,000 should not be gone into in detail by the Appropriations Committee to determine the reason why that money was left over and not spent.

After developing that point to some extent, he continued:

Good business practice requires a constant review of financial programs in the light of changing conditions. When the Congress acts on one of the regular appropriation bills, it is passing on a program to finance activities over a year in the future. It is acting on a budget prepared over 18 months in advance of the end of the fiscal year concerned.

Estimates for the annual budget are submitted to the Bureau of the Budget in September of each year. The programs proposed have generally been prepared in the field several months earlier. The funds involved are not available until the following July; that is, about a year later. Exigencies may cause long delays before the actual projects can be placed under way. Should the review of the Senate in connection with the appropriation bill be the last consideration of the project until it is built? No sound business enterprise could be so dogmatically operated.

In other words, the President then was arguing repeatedly for a review, and he went on to point out the peril:

I should like to see the objective accomplished, but I believe it will be necessary to make a complete and thorough investigation of the situation. Unless we do so, when we make an appropriation we shall encourage administrative officials to spend it for fear that it will be taken away from them and put back into the Treasury. There are specific instances of expenditures having been held up, to a good purpose. I think there ought to be a proper way to get that money back into the Treasury without warning the agencies that unless they spend it they will have to give it up.

I have come in contact with spending agencies of the War Department which have

urged their employees to spend the money before the year is out so they could say that it was gone.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield me 2 minutes?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. The then Senator Truman continued:

We know that we cannot undertake everything at once. There are not enough men, materials, equipment, or money to let us prosecute the war to our utmost ability and concurrently undertake the many desirable general improvements unrelated to the war.

Numerous other projects have been appropriated for since the beginning of the war, and while such projects were fully justified at the time, it is to be expected that the rapidly changing conditions facing the country, and the need for eliminating or deferring all nonessential projects at a time when the Nation is under heavy financial, material, and manpower strain fully warrant the deferment of many projects at this time. It is essential that all appropriations once made be given a continual review by the executive branch, and that reserves against such appropriations be set up pending such time as the Nation is in a better position to afford such expenditures which the President and the executive branch might determine are not absolutely essential to the war effort.

These words seem to me to be well considered.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield time to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment, striking from the pending amendment the words "without impairing national defense", and substituting therefor the words "with the least possible reduction of national defense." I fear that unless such an amendment is made, this reduction can be regarded as no reduction whatsoever, because the military would take the attitude that any reduction of these amounts would impair national defense. Therefore this amendment might not be effective. For that reason I hope the distinguished Senator from New Jersey, who offered the amendment, will be willing to accept my amendment to it.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I accept the modification.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Jersey modifies his amendment, which he has a right to do.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am glad to accept the suggestion of the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS].

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I should like to take a few seconds to call the attention of Senators and of those who may read the RECORD in the future, to the very excellent statement of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], on the duties and responsibilities of the Congress with reference to defense expenditures, which were outlined in a

statement by General Eisenhower, then Chief of Staff, in an appearance before the House committee. It seems to me that that statement is the definitive statement of our duties and our responsibilities.

Mr. CASE. I thank the Senator from Vermont for his very kind remarks.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield 1 minute to my colleague [Mr. HENDRICKSON].

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I shall not take 1 minute. I thank my colleague for this time. All I wish to say is that I heartily commend the distinguished senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the distinguished junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], and the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] for the very effective effort which they have made to reduce the appropriations in this bill. It is a move in the right direction. The junior Senator from New Jersey does not think that it is a sufficient reduction, but I am glad that the distinguished Senator from Wyoming has accepted the amendment. I would have heartily cosponsored the amendment had I been given the opportunity. I shall support the amendment.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator has 1 minute.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I should like to make one further observation, if I may.

In the first place, I wish to thank the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] for his kind act in accepting this amendment. In line with the discussion, it may be in the minds of some persons that this amendment is aimed at the so-called \$5,000,000,000 fund. That is not the case. This amendment applies to the entire appropriation, all the way through.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. BREWSTER. Does the Senator feel that there would be serious objection on the other side if we were to use 5 percent instead of 2½ percent? Five percent has been rather generally recognized as an appropriate percentage.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I will say to the Senator from Maine that I originally suggested 5 percent, but in consultation with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], we all agreed on the figure of 2½ percent in this particular amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], after first saying that, having accepted the amendment, I hope it will be adopted by the Senate.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, there has been considerable discussion of this amendment, after it was accepted. However, I think it is proper for us to discuss it, because it represents a cut of about \$1,500,000,000 in a defense appropriation bill. I know that every member of the committee has been greatly

concerned because of the size of the appropriations contained in the pending bill, and was desirous, if possible, really to reduce the amount. I believe that the reduction proposed can be made without any harmful effect upon the national defense, when we bear in mind that there is a carryover this year of a little more than \$36,000,000,000. There will be no reason or excuse for failure on the part of the Armed Services to reduce their budgets by 2½ percent, and it will not be necessary for them to come to Congress next year and seek to have it restored. With the proper degree of efficiency in the Defense Department, the 2½ percent reduction can be easily absorbed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad that the Senator from Wyoming has accepted the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 71, between lines 10 and 11, it is proposed to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 633. The appropriations made by this act shall be reduced, through the apportionment procedure provided for in section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, by an amount equal to 50 percent of the total amount of such appropriations.

On page 71, line 11, it is proposed to strike out "SEC. 633." and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 634."

Mr. LANGER. I am one of those who feel that this is no time for hysteria. There can be spent only a definite amount of money each year, no matter how much we appropriate. There is available a carry-over of \$36,000,000,000. In view of the fact that this matter has been thoroughly debated, I shall not say any more about it at this time.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I raise a point of order against the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair sustains the point of order. It is evidently legislation on an appropriation bill.

The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I do not understand why a point of order should be sustained. We cut the amount in the bill by 2½ percent a few moments ago. I am asking that it be cut by 50 percent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment would impose additional duties on departments under the revised statutes referred to in the amendment. That is obviously legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I offer another amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 71, between lines 10 and 11, it is proposed to insert a new section as follows:

SEC. 633. The appropriations made by this act shall be reduced, through the apportionment procedure provided for in section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, by an amount equal to 40 percent of the total amount of such appropriations.

On page 71, line 11, it is proposed to strike out "SEC. 633." and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 634."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, this amendment is subject to the same point of order, and I regret that I am compelled to raise it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I send another amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 71, between lines 10 and 11, it is proposed to insert a new section as follows:

SEC. 633. The appropriations made by this act shall be reduced by an amount equal to 30 percent of the total amount of such appropriations.

On page 71, line 11, it is proposed to strike out "SEC. 633." and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 634."

Mr. LANGER. The argument I made a few moments ago on behalf of a 50-percent reduction I now make in behalf of a 30-percent reduction. I ask for a vote.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I send another amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 71, between lines 10 and 11 it is proposed to insert a new section as follows:

SEC. 633. The appropriations made by this act shall be reduced by an amount equal to 20 percent of the total amount of such appropriations.

On page 71, line 11, it is proposed to strike out "SEC. 633." and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 634."

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, as I said before, there is \$36,000,000,000 now available. That is an enormous amount. It cannot all be spent in the next 18 months. Congress will be in session again in January, and will be here most of next year. We can take care of any situation that may arise.

In my opinion, the taxpayers certainly ought to have the feeling that we are not appropriating \$61,000,000,000. In addition to that, psychologically it would have a very bad effect on our allies in Europe to do so. Therefore, I ask for a vote.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I send another amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following:

For construction of six transcontinental four-lane highways, three of which shall run from north to south and three of which shall run from east to west, and bridges and approaches thereto situated on such highways, \$5,000,000,000, to remain available until expended, and to be expended in accordance with the Federal Highway Act, as amended: *Provided*, That any unexpended balances of this appropriation shall be available for expenditure in accordance with such act for secondary and feeder roads and bridges and approaches thereto situated on such roads.

Mr. LANGER. It seems to me that no better defense of our country could be provided than would be provided by good roads. The Bureau of Public Roads announced some time ago that it would take nearly \$15,000,000,000 to put our roads in good shape. Certainly we need military highways. This bill would provide for the construction of six transcontinental four-lane highways, three running north and south, and three running east and west. The balance of the \$5,000,000,000 available would be used for the construction of farm-to-market roads. I ask for a vote on the amendment.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair cannot recognize any Senator unless time is yielded to him. The Senator from Wyoming controls the time in opposition. The Senator from North Dakota controls the time in behalf of the amendment. Does either Senator yield some time to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the amendment. I ask that after the word "highways" in the first line of the amendment, there be inserted "two of which shall cross the State of North Dakota."

Mr. LANGER. I accept the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota, as modified.

The amendment, as modified, was rejected.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I offer another amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to insert the following:

Extension of telephone service: For loans to assist in providing telephone facilities to farmers and persons living in rural areas who are not adequately supplied with telephone services, such loans to be made by the Secretary of Agriculture in the same manner and upon the same terms and conditions, insofar as practicable, as loans made for rural electrification purposes, \$5,000,000,000.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, since World War I we have given away to our allies, roughly \$92,000,000,000. During that same time Senator after Senator,

particularly the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], has time and again introduced measures to provide \$3,000,000,000 for rural telephones in the United States. It seems to me that the taxpayers who are now being called upon to pay, roughly, \$59,000,000,000, especially those in the most isolated areas of the country, ought to get rural telephones. I ask for a vote.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I send another amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to add a new section, as follows:

SEC. —. (a) There is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$5,000,000,000 which shall be available to the Commissioner of Education (hereinafter referred to as the "Commissioner") for the purpose of making loans, as provided in this section to individuals desiring to obtain vocational, technical, academic, or professional education beyond the high-school level.

(b) (1) Any person who is a citizen of the United States, and who has successfully completed a high-school course, or its equivalent, shall, upon application therefor approved by the Commissioner, be eligible for a loan under this Act in an amount not to exceed \$1,500.

(2) An application for a loan under this act shall be in such form and contain such information as may be prescribed by the Commissioner and shall contain (A) a statement by the applicant that he has not theretofore received a loan under this act; (B) a statement of the course of study or training proposed to be undertaken by the applicant; (C) a statement by the applicant that the loan applied for is necessary to such undertaking, and that, if granted, the proceeds thereof will be used to defray the costs of tuition, fees, books, supplies, board, lodging, and other necessary expenses incident to such study or training; and (D) a certification by an educational or training institution that it has found the applicant qualified for such course of study and that it is willing to admit him for such purpose.

(c) Such loans shall be made without security, except that the borrower shall execute a promissory note payable to the United States. Such note shall mature 15 years after the date of the loan, and shall bear interest at the rate of 1 percent per annum. If the applicant is a minor, such note shall bear the endorsement of his parent or guardian.

(d) No loan shall be made to any person for any period during which he is receiving education or training under title II of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944.

(e) (1) The Commissioner is authorized to promulgate such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

(2) Nothing in this section shall be construed to authorize the Commissioner to exercise any influence upon the choice by an applicant for a loan under this section of a course of training or study or of the educational or training institution at which such course is to be pursued, or to authorize the Commissioner to exercise any supervision or control over any such institution.

(3) The provisions of this section shall be administered without discrimination

against any person on account of his race, color, or creed.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, during World War II approximately 600,000 young men of America were not taken into the armed services because their lack of education did not permit them to qualify for induction. Certainly, if we are going to build planes and tanks, we ought to make some provision whereby the youth of America, thousands of whom patriotically want to serve but are barred because of educational disqualifications, ought to have a chance to get an education.

The amendment further provides for the erection of schoolhouses. I think every Senator is familiar with the fact that we receive from all over the country petitions asking for the appropriation of money for the building of schoolhouses.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask for a vote on the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I offer another amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to add the following:

SEC. —. (a) There is hereby appropriated the sum of \$5,000,000,000 or so much thereof as may be necessary to enable the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service to carry out the provisions of subsection (b).

(b) The Surgeon General of the Public Health Service shall, with such equipment and facilities as may be available to him and with the cooperation of agencies and officials of the States and the municipalities and counties thereof, and of other Federal agencies, provide the means for securing a specimen of the urine of each person in the United States and the examination and analysis of such specimen. Upon making such an examination and analysis, a report of the findings shall be made to the person furnishing such specimen. If such examination and analysis discloses that such person has some disease, a report of such fact shall be made to the health authorities of the municipality or county wherein such person resides. No person shall be permitted to obtain an examination and analysis of a specimen furnished by him more often than once every 6 months.

(c) The Surgeon General of the Public Health Service is authorized to make such rules and regulations as he deems necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I make the point of order that the amendment proposes legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I understand that I have the floor.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, my point of order is that the amendment proposed legislation on an appropriation bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The point of order has been made, and the Chair sustains it, for the amendment obviously proposes legislation to an appropriation bill.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I now send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to add the following:

SEC. —. There is hereby appropriated the sum of \$5,000,000,000 to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to finance the construction of elevators and other structures for the storage of agricultural commodities.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, at this time there is a terrific shortage of box cars. All over the Middle West grain has been piled on the ground and has spoiled. That occurs year after year because of the fact that the Commodity Credit Corporation lets the grain remain in the elevators during the winter months, and then tries to move it after the loans expire on the 30th of April, after which time the farmer still has 60 days in which to decide whether to apply for a loan.

Under the provisions of the amendment, \$5,000,000,000 would be available for the building of terminal storage elevators which would have a capacity of millions upon millions of bushels, so that we could do away with the eternal, everlasting shortage of boxcars which during the 11 years I have served in the Senate has been a constant source of trouble to Senators and has involved great financial loss to the farmers of the United States.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, to this amendment I have to make the same point of order, namely, that the amendment proposes legislation to an appropriation bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment is clearly subject to the point of order, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I send to the desk my last amendment, which I submit and ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to add the following:

SEC. —. To encourage the storage of grain on farms, where it can be stored at the lowest cost, there is hereby appropriated the sum of \$5,000,000,000 to enable the Commodity Credit Corporation to make loans to grain growers needing storage facilities when such growers shall apply to the Corporation for financing the construction or purchase of suitable storage.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, of course it is obvious that the purpose of this amendment is to enable the Commodity Credit Corporation to have additional funds with which to purchase farm products. At the present time farmers all over the Northwest are unable to obtain more than the cash value for their wheat or the cash value for their other grain crops, due to the fact that the elevators are plugged. It is impossible to make a loan with the Commodity Credit Corporation through any of the elevators. One reason is the shortage of funds. It is for that reason that the amendment is submitted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota.

The amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to further amendment.

If there is no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, on this question I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Massachusetts will state it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, is not an hour allowed to each side, with 1 hour to be in charge of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and 1 hour to be in charge of the minority leader or the acting minority leader?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is correct; and such time may be used if desired.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes of my time to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I intend to vote for the pending military appropriations bill. I have voted for the cuts proposed in the bill because I do not feel satisfied that any such tremendous expenditures are absolutely necessary for the defense of the United States. However, of course, it is impossible to oppose a military appropriation bill when it comes to the final vote on it.

In time of war it is almost impossible to criticize or to reduce in any respect the appropriation demands of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Corps. In time of peace, however, we face a somewhat different situation. I see no reason why the military appropriations should not be subjected to just as severe scrutiny in time of peace as that to which any other appropriations are subjected.

I feel very strongly that we do not know the basic policy upon which these appropriations are predicated. There is just as much danger in overdoing appropriations and expenditures in time of peace as there is a military danger in not providing sufficient appropriating in that field, because after all, a question of degree is involved.

It is almost impossible for those of us who are not military experts to know exactly what appropriations are necessary, but there is at least some definite limit on the capacity of the United States to spend money. As I estimate the expenditures contemplated in the current fiscal year we will spend about \$70,000,000,000, although the appropriations will amount to \$100,000,000,000 or more. The testimony before the Finance Com-

mittee by Mr. Wilson, however, indicated that by fiscal 1953 we would be spending in the neighborhood of from \$85,000,000,000 to \$90,000,000,000, and since that time the President in the economic message has indicated his belief that we need a larger Armed Force than 3,500,000 men. This bill, itself, may provide for more than that number, in the additional appropriation of \$5,000,000,000 added by the committee.

Furthermore, we have a warning, I understand, from the Secretary of State, that \$8,500,000,000 a year for 3 years for foreign aid is probably an underestimate of what may be necessary. We shall be asked for closer to \$40,000,000,000 or \$45,000,000,000.

I think it fair to conclude from an analysis of the figures that at the rate at which money is being appropriated, in fiscal 1953 and in fiscal 1954 we shall be spending at the rate of \$100,000,000,000 a year. In addition to that, nearly \$20,000,000,000 a year is being spent by State and local governments. All these sums represent a total expenditure of \$120,000,000,000 out of the national income, which is approximately \$260,000,000,000.

In this figure representing the estimated expenditures I think we have reached the point of danger. There is certainly a point beyond which we cannot spend without inflation, whether we raise the taxes to meet the outlay or whether we borrow the money. In a world war, it is necessary to borrow money. During the late war we borrowed \$50,000,000,000 a year for 4 years, which had the inevitable result of raising the price level in this country approximately 70 percent during that period. With the present spending, while it is not such all-out spending as that, I think it is going to be very difficult to avoid inflation, with all of the labor difficulties which arise from it, with undue boom prices, followed by undue depression, a general weakening of the economic structure of the country, with a threat to the very economic production which is the strength of the Nation in any war, which has been the reason for our victory in two wars, and which is the one thing in which we are so infinitely superior to Russia that it will result ultimately in our victory in any third world war, if such a tragedy should come about.

After all, the matter of military expenditure is a question of degree. It was only in March 1950 that General Bradley, the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, appeared before the Appropriations Committee and said, "Yes, \$13,000,000,000 a year is sufficient to provide for the security of the United States." He said, "The Joint Chiefs of Staff might like \$14,000,000,000 or \$15,000,000,000, perhaps, a little more or a little less, but the Joint Chiefs of Staff," he said, "never went along with this large figure of \$20,000,000,000 a year to protect the security of the United States." It was only 18 months ago that he made that statement, and Russia was the same Russia. There has been a revelation in the fact that Russia is willing to use satellite troops in Korea for

actual military attack, which had not known would happen; but so far as concerned the mentality of the people who were trying to decide what was necessary for the defense of the United States, conditions were just the same then as now, and General Bradley said, "If I recommended as much as \$30,000,000,000 a year for the Armed Forces, I ought to be dismissed as Chief of Staff."

When Congress reassembled after the outbreak of the Korean War, it was estimated 2,100,000 men would be needed in the Armed Forces. It is now the desire to add to the Armed Forces from 1,500,000 to 2,100,000. By the time Congress met in December 1950, it was decided that 2,700,000 was the proper number to have in the Armed Forces. By January 1951, 1 month later, the Department wanted 3,300,000 men. As we have finally settled on the number this year, roughly speaking the appropriations are all based on a force of 3,500,000 men. In July the President said, "We do not think that is a sufficient number. That is only an interim goal. We are going to have a great many more men than that, and we are now studying to tell you how many additional men we need." The number is related to the conditions we face. If we want absolutely 100 percent of national security, we probably have to be ready to fight a full scale war tomorrow.

During the late World War we spent about one-half of our total national income on war, and with production at the present rate, if the same ratio obtained we could spend a total of \$150,000,000,000, nearly all of it on the military program. That is probably what we would spend in all-out war; but in time of peace, we simply cannot keep the country in readiness to fight an all-out war tomorrow, unless we are willing to turn our Government into a garrison state for the next 10 years, and abandon all the ideals of freedom upon which the Nation has been erected. It is impossible to secure absolute security, and even if we spent all that money, just one Pearl Harbor will put us in exactly the same danger we faced in 1941 and the years following. It is impossible to have such a thing in this world as absolute security. We must be selective. We must decide what we are going to do, and what we are not going to do, in time of peace.

Mr. President, speaking on the floor of the Senate, heretofore, I stated that in my opinion we ought to devote our attention for the most part to preparedness on the sea and in the air. In my opinion it is almost impossible to hope to fight a land war on the continent of Europe or on the continent of Asia within a day after a war starts. This general program is large, because I think in the back of the minds of the men who make it, they still hold the theory that the moment war starts we shall transport a tremendous American Army to Europe and undertake in Europe a battle against Russia. I think it would probably be the most dangerous military experiment we have ever tried. I do not know that to be so, for I have no means of being absolutely certain what the program is, or how it is outlined, except insofar as it is made known to the Congress. I only

know there is presented a very serious danger to the whole economy of the United States, unless in time of peace we hold appropriations within a reasonable figure.

What is that figure? Mr. President, I myself think that about \$75,000,000,000 a year is pretty nearly the limit of what the Federal Government can spend and hope to maintain any stability in our present economy, controls or no controls. If we were to add to that \$20,000,000,000 of domestic expenditures, the total would be \$95,000,000,000, and \$95,000,000,000 is a good deal more than one-third—about 35 percent—of the present national income.

In England they have gotten up to 40 percent of the national income, and it has resulted in a complete stifling of private enterprise and a complete stifling of all progress, as a permanent matter.

I do not know how long this program is to continue, but, once embarked on it, unless we have a radical change of thought, I, myself, have not much hope that it will not continue at about the same rate. True, it is the hope that, so far as production items are concerned, there will be a peak and then a descending scale; but my impression is that our equipment will become obsolete and we shall have new weapons, and new kinds of airplanes, and that we are embarked on an expenditure of this kind for 5, 10, 15, or 20 years, as one of the generals stated; and if so, I think it means an end of progress and an end of the freedom of the people of the United States.

I have no suggestion to make, except this: I think before Congress adjourns, it should provide for the appointment of a commission to survey the military policy of the United States. I do not mean a "watch dog committee" of Congress, to see how the money is spent; I mean a commission of civilians to sit down with the military authorities and try to determine what is the proper scope of the military activity of the United States, to make a frank study of the situation, find out what it is we are trying to do, and what it is we are not trying to do; what we shall do if war starts, and what we shall not do if war starts. If such a report can be made, I think an effective system can be worked out, based on which our expenditures need not be in excess of \$75,000,000,000 a year or in that neighborhood.

Last fall I read an article in *Fortune* magazine in which Mr. Eccles estimated that to be about the limit of what we could spend without upsetting the Nation's economy. Mr. Roswell McGill, former Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, had an article in the *Saturday Evening Post* last month. He put the figure at about that amount. I think as an emergency proposition, we can perhaps get up to about a third of the national income. I would think that, currently, anything over 25 percent of the national income in taxes is a real danger to the country, and, if we have an emergency, it seems to me the limit should be about a third.

If we can be convinced that tremendous military expenditures are absolutely essential to the national security, we

ought to recognize the fact. We should also realize that we are going to have inflation, which we must accept along with other evils, because we have no choice. That should be considered in any such complete study as I suggest.

So, Mr. President, I am going to vote for this bill, but I certainly feel that in the scale of spending which is now contemplated, and which may be increased in another 18 months or 2 years, is dangerous to the economy of the United States, and that we ought to have a complete reconsideration of the economic and political policy on which such spending is based.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I have listened with a great deal of attention and interest, as always, to the comments of the Senator from Ohio. There can be no doubt in the mind of any intelligent person that we are in a very critical situation. As a matter of fact, the truth is that the system of private property is undergoing a fundamental test. Some of us seem to approach this problem as though it were an ordinary economic problem, an ordinary problem of fiscal policy which could be settled by banking-house methods; but certainly that is not the fact.

Anyone who has taken the time to read the speeches and the books of Stalin and of his predecessors must know that from the time of Karl Marx the Communist theory has been that the capitalistic system is through, that it is outmoded, that it is bound to fall of its own weight. It did fall in Germany, and totalitarianism took over. Hitler joined hands with Stalin when both of them thought it would be possible to wipe out anything resembling a free world and a free choice of individuals.

It is utterly impossible, it seems to me, to say that we can close our eyes to the great conflict which is in progress. This is not a time of peace; this is a time of war—cold war, and hot war, too. Our men and the men of the United Nations are in conflict with the forces of communism in Korea. We have been sending military power to strengthen Greece and Turkey, and it has been done by the Congress of the United States. There has been no question about the policy. We have a policy.

The Marshall plan was inaugurated by a Republican Congress. The Truman plan for the containment of communism in Greece and Turkey, a plan which was successful, was supported on all sides. There was no partisan division, nor was there any real division on the basis of economic thought or financial policy. We knew we had to do the job, difficult though it is, backbreaking though it may be.

My deep sympathy goes out to the members of the Finance Committee who are struggling with the problem of trying to find ways and means of raising additional funds to carry on the program. The policy which is laid down and which is being carried on under the direction of Mr. Charles E. Wilson, former president of the General Electric Co., who cannot be called a Socialist, who cannot be called a Communist, who is a representative of what we call a free

economy, is intended to devote to military expenditures not to exceed 20 percent of the national income.

The Senator from Ohio just expressed the belief that that can be done. Well, that is the policy. The estimates which we have received are well within every estimate which the Senator from Ohio made that the expenditures next year will be less than \$75,000,000,000. The economy of the United States can carry that load. But we shall not have to expend that much money.

Mr. President, there is one thought which I desire to make crystal clear, if I can, namely, that our system of private property is at stake. Capitalism itself is at stake. Why did it fail in Europe? Why is there socialism in Europe? Why was Hitler able to overthrow capitalism? Why was it in danger in Italy, where Mussolini overthrew it? Why was it in danger in France, where there is a great communistic movement. Because the people there were unable to come to grips with private monopoly, with industrial and economic collectivists. We talk as though we are opposed to the totalitarian march of Stalin, and we close our eyes completely to the fact that there was no possibility of political collectivism and totalitarianism in Europe until, first, economic collectivism had been established by the transfer of the control of the economic life of the people into the hands of a few monopolists who controlled the industry and the economy.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is not that exactly what we are doing in this country—exercising control over the economic life of the people?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No, I do not think so. I believe the great bulk of the leaders of industry are in favor of preventing the growth of monopoly. And they will prevent it. I have great faith in the intelligence and the will of the people of America, and I make no distinction as to where their place is to be found, whether they are farmers, whether they are working in factories, whether they are working for corporations, or whether they are in management. Over and over again we have had evidence of their complete willingness to rally to this cause. We are defending the system which was established in the United States of America when the Constitution was drafted, which gave to the world for the first time a government controlled by the people, with power to regulate every authority which can be exercised over them, including economic authority and political authority as well.

What is provided in the pending bill is not leading us as a nation down the road to the destruction of the capitalistic system. By this bill we are trying to save the capitalistic system.

The best means for its preservation will be found, I must confess, not in the weapons we are creating, but in a clear conscience among the people of America with their purpose to preserve the freedom of opportunity for all individuals without control by either the Government or monopolistic groups.

Of course, Mr. President, in an emergency of this kind, we must have different kinds of Government controls, but there has never been a time in real war, or in the present cold war, when controls have been enacted, that Congress has not placed a limitation upon them, so it would be made clear that we were not giving and granting away the fundamental authority of the people to control themselves.

We want to see a return as soon as possible to a free economy all over the world, and we know that unless we show the way to the peoples of other nations we shall be left alone against a Communist world. If that time comes, the capitalistic system and the system of private property will be in serious straits.

Let no one think that the people of America cannot rise to this challenge just as they have risen to every other challenge in their history. From the days of the establishment of our Nation down to this hour, the people of America have had the intelligence and the courage to do what the occasion demanded in order to preserve human freedom.

This bill is intended merely to provide the money whereby we can produce the weapons and the air power necessary, if the occasion arises, to carry military destruction to the very heart of the tyrannical dictators who are seeking to conquer the world.

Mr. President, the bill should be passed without any reservation.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK].

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, during the discussion of the past several days of the huge military appropriation bill, many amendments were submitted, the objectives of which were to reduce specific items. I voted for most of those amendments because I believe that in the military services of this country, as well as in the other departments and agencies, there is the responsibility of economizing, of saving money, so that appropriations and expenditures may be reduced.

During the debate on the bill, members of the Appropriations Committee resisted those specific amendments because it was contended that when the military budget officers ask for certain sums of money with which to implement our preparedness program we must consider their requests as being so sacrosanct that we cannot justify cutting the appropriations by a single dollar. Yet a few minutes ago the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee accepted an amendment to reduce the expenditures by 2½ percent, or approximately \$1,100,000,000. The same argument could have been raised against that amendment by the chairman, but obviously he recognized that there is a responsibility resting upon the legislative branch of government controlling the purse strings to do everything possible to insist upon economy in the armed services and elsewhere.

I recall some of the experiences we had during the years of World War II. The same statements were then made

whenever anyone proposed any economy in appropriations for the armed services. But I recall that in each of 2 years during World War II there was an unexpended balance or surplus of more than \$30,000,000,000 in the appropriations made by Congress for the armed services. Mr. President, that meant that in these two instances there were miscalculations by the armed services, so that they were unable to spend \$30,000,000,000 in a single year during 2 years of World War II.

I submit that as indicating that there is plenty of room for economizing in the appropriations for the armed services. I think that we can get economy, we can get greater efficiency in the operations of the armed services only when those in charge, from the Secretary of Defense down through the procurement division and the other levels and echelons of the armed services, recognize that military preparedness is essential, but likewise that we must have a strong national economy as a vital part of our over-all preparedness to resist Communist aggression.

Mr. President, I have supported the various amendments because I think it is the duty of Congress to insist upon taking every element of profiteering out of our preparedness program and out of the expenditures for war, if war should occur.

I recognize that we must stabilize our economy. I recognize that we must do everything within our power to resist and curb inflationary trends. It is one thing for the armed services to contend that they must have \$50,000,000,000 or \$60,000,000,000 or \$75,000,000,000 with which to build up preparedness to safeguard the country. That may be true to some extent, but likewise we must recognize that we must strengthen our economy so that we will be able to resist Communist aggression and fight a successful war, if we should become involved in one.

So, Mr. President, I am happy to vote for the bill on the basis that we must do everything within our power to build up our preparedness, and at the same time to insist that Congress take the position that the armed services must economize and recognize their responsibility, because without such cooperation on the part of the officials in the three branches of our Armed Forces we cannot have the economy which is vital to the security of our country.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I yield 7 minutes to the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPPEL].

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUNT in the chair). The Senator from Kansas is recognized for 7 minutes.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Mr. President, at the outset I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD in connection with what I have to say a statement with reference to the utilization of the Reserves of the United States Armed Forces.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SCHOEPPPEL
THE UTILIZATION OF THE RESERVES OF THE
UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES

I have been extremely attentive to the debate on the pending legislation, H. R. 5054, an act making appropriations for the National Security Council, the National Security Resources Board, and for military functions administered by the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

There are many phases of this legislation which concern me. The over-all cost of this bill is staggering.

I am fundamentally opposed to package legislation of this type.

I am mindful of the long and conscientious labor that has been expended on the legislation by members of the committee.

On Tuesday, September 11, the Senate saw fit to agree to an amendment striking out the following provision:

"No part of any appropriation contained in this act for 'pay and allowances' of military personnel shall be expended for the pay or allowances, accruing after November 30, 1951, of any member of the Inactive or Volunteer Reserve who served on active duty for a period of 12 months or more in any branch of the Armed Forces during the period beginning December 7, 1941, and ending September 2, 1945, if such member shall have served on active duty for a period of 12 months or more after June 26, 1950, unless such member shall have voluntarily consented to remain on active duty."

The purpose of that provision was to ensure that the men who fought World War II, would not be forced to carry the burden of world war III.

I am of the opinion that the Senate acted unwisely when this provision was removed.

I have read with great interest the statements received from the armed services relative to their intentions concerning reservists.

As submitted to the Senate by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], at this time I would like to have included in my remarks those memoranda: Letters from (1) L. T. Dubose, reflecting the Navy point of view; (2) James P. Goode, reflecting the Air Force point of view; and (3) Earl B. Johnson, reflecting the Army point of view.

It is my opinion that in no instance are categorical assurances given that provide proper protection for the interests of the active and inactive reservists.

I fully understand that the debate on this floor has pointed out the confusion which exists in regard to the Reserve program.

I realize that it is the wish of a large group in the Senate that when the bill goes to conference, a clear-cut statement of the position of the reservists should be forthcoming.

I have no reason to believe, however, that the statement which is forthcoming will be satisfactory to me or to those who are members of the Reserves.

My office has received hundreds of letters from active and inactive members of the Reserves of the Armed Forces. They are, without exception, bitter in their denunciation of the program which has been unfairly handled.

They, without exception, believe that the Government has violated the contract which they entered.

As my colleagues know, all the way through, I have been bitterly opposed to the way the reserve program was being handled. I voted against universal military training and have advocated that no man who has served a minimum of 6 months overseas should have been called up in the Korean police action until those who never served

before had been called up and all other available sources had been tapped. That made sense to me a year ago, and it makes sense now.

I lay no claim to being a military analyst, but I can read and the news from Korea, insofar as I am concerned, is ominous.

I well recall the days, prior to the collapse and fall of China, when the Communists used the identical tactics against the Nationalist forces which are being used against us in Korea today.

The practice of continual peace negotiations, while we relax and they build up forces, will ultimately lead, and I wish my Senate colleagues to hear me well, will ultimately lead to another savage onslaught which will take its toll in the blood of American men.

It was the intention of the drafters of this legislation in the House of Representatives of the United States that the provision contained on page 55 relative to the service of reservists be a part of the legislation.

The Constitution of the United States provides that the Congress shall make rules and regulations for the government of the Armed Forces of the United States.

I am not, and will not, be satisfied until we write into legislation positive assurances that the military burden of the catastrophic Korean adventure will be spread evenly, and I am hopeful that the conferees will sustain the House position in this original measure.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Mr. President, reluctantly I shall vote for the pending military appropriation bill. I do not mean reluctantly from the standpoint of not wanting to expend funds to defend my country. I realize we must do that. I say reluctantly because of the amount that is involved. I shall vote for the bill because there is no alternative. I was one of those who cast votes for some of the amendments to reduce this over-all expenditure of \$61,000,000,000 and especially I was in favor of the Flanders motion. I fully realize that a large part of the great sums we are considering in this bill are needed for our national defenses. Our defenses should be built up. I am not going to dispute that, and I am sure no one disputes it. But I seriously doubt that the military should be given the enormous sum of \$61,000,000,000, which was the amount carried in the bill until the reductions were made by the amendments which were adopted, and we did not adopt too many reduction amendments.

Mr. President, I was not privileged to be a member of the Appropriations Committee. I know the committee has worked diligently, hard, and conscientiously. But in view of the fact that at this time, so I am informed, there are unexpended balances amounting to billions of dollars from appropriations which Congress has made for the military forces, and which the military forces have not been able to obligate or spend, naturally I assumed that we could get along with a lesser amount than that provided by the bill. Be that as it may, I happen to be one of those who feel that if we are ever going to economize we should do so now. So this military appropriation should have been reduced. In my candid opinion it could have been reduced more than it was when it came to this floor.

The Congress has the responsibility to economize. It controls the purse strings, and it should never abrogate that right or that power. We should provide adequate funds, yes; but at the same time we should guard the economic future of our Nation.

I would also prefer to cut out some other things we are financing in this country, and for which the Congress is called upon to provide funds and direct those savings to building up the military defense of this Nation. I thought that approximately \$55,000,000,000 for defense at this time should be sufficient.

The funds we appropriate should be wisely spent. It should be someone's responsibility to see to it that they are wisely spent. I know that frequently there is a tendency in certain departments of the Government—and I do not want to be ultracritical—when they have access to huge sums of money, billion and billions of dollars, not to be so careful of the public tax money as we would like to see them be. I know there must be supervision, and I hope there will be careful scrutiny of the money that is spent. I want to see it wisely spent.

Mr. President, we must be painfully aware that this Nation has passed the time when we can rather generously draw on its future resources of this Nation. There are Members of the Senate now on this floor, members of certain committees of the Congress, who have labored religiously and hard to try to increase taxes in the tax bill upon which they have been working. That task has not been an easy one. Those Members will tell you, Mr. President, that they do not know where to turn next to get a few additional billions of dollars, and when our citizens get their tax bills, I am sure each will know what I mean. We are brought to the chilling realization that there is a limit to which we can tax the people of the country. Our taxes are mounting. They are crushing, confiscatory, and are going to become blackouts upon the initiative of the citizens of the Nation. When the taxing process goes too far, then the Government takes over, and we will all be the loser. Somehow we do not think of these things.

I know it has been said here, and we hear it frequently on the outside, that this Nation is not so badly off as are some of the other nations of the world. Still in my book, Mr. President, and to my way of thinking, it is no consolation for us to say that the other nations are faring worse than we are, and therefore we can be brought down to a lower level.

In closing, Mr. President, I merely want to say that I am hopeful that the billions of dollars we are voting today in this measure will properly prepare the defenses of this country. We have had the starkest reality presented to us and to the country as a whole, that we thought we were better equipped than we really were when certain contingencies developed. I am hoping that there will be a safeguarding of the funds we are providing, that a watchful eye will be kept over these expenditures, the huge billions we are voting by this measure, so that the American taxpayer and the defenses of the country will receive as

nearly 100-percent value as possible out of every dollar we are voting in this appropriation.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, only a few short years ago, in 1945, we were called upon in the Senate to vote upon the adoption of the Charter of the United Nations. At that time the then distinguished Senator from Minnesota, Mr. Shipstead, and I were the only two Senators who voted against it. I wish to say today that I have never regretted my vote. I desire to read two or three excerpts from a very short speech which I delivered upon that occasion. I said then:

I would be willing to vote for the appropriation of the last dollar in the United States Treasury and the last dollar we could borrow if by spending that money we could eliminate war, which we all abhor and hate. I would unhesitatingly vote for the Charter if I felt that it offered even the tiniest hope of a permanent peace. But instead of that, Mr. President, I feel from the bottom of my heart that the adoption of the Charter will mean perpetuating war. I feel it will mean the enslavement of millions of people, from Poland to India, from Korea to Java, as well as people in many other places on this earth.

I continued:

Mr. President, I feel that the adoption of the Charter will be one step more toward compulsory and military conscription and all that which goes with war.

I continued and discussed the veto power, and showed how the veto power in the Charter absolutely wrecked any possibility of the Charter being a success.

Upon various occasions I have heard distinguished Senators rise on the floor of the Senate and ask that the Charter be amended. I have heard them say that the Secretary of State should never agree to allow Red China to come into the United Nations. But if Senators will read the Charter carefully they will find that Dean Acheson cannot stop it. If the majority is against us, the United States is stuck.

The United Nations accomplished something. It provided a place in New York where Jacob Malik could speak to 20,000,000 people over television, and to millions more over the radio, telling all about the glories of communism, with the Government of the United States paying 70 percent of the bill. What is the use of having Senate committees chasing some poor devil of a Communist here and there, when the leader of them all, financed by the United States, can go to New York and speak to the entire United States?

We have an unexpended balance of military appropriations amounting to \$36,000,000,000, which has not been used. The report shows \$44,000,000,000, but I assume that some of it has been used since the report was printed. As was stated by the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], only a few months ago Gen. Omar Bradley himself said that \$13,000,000,000 a year was all that the

Joint Chiefs of Staff recommended. So everything the Joint Chiefs of Staff asked for a few months ago is now in the Treasury of the United States unexpended.

We are being asked to appropriate \$61,000,000,000. If that is added to all the other money we have appropriated and given away, it will mean a debt which will be almost inconceivable in the minds of the people of the average city, town, village, or county in the United States.

We made a loan to England at a time when a veteran returning home owed \$5,000, but a veteran returning home to Great Britain owed only \$1,339. Yet, the Senate voted for it. I suppose that today the Senate, by an overwhelming vote, will approve appropriations of \$59,000,000,000 or \$60,000,000,000. I do not propose, without a protest, to fasten such an enormous debt upon the backs of the American people.

What are we doing? We are fostering communism. We are fostering nationalization of farms, of mines, of railroads—yes, even of steel.

I have been amazed at the fact that so few Senators, aside from the members of the committee, knew what was in the bill in the last analysis. I have read the report from beginning to end. When I offered an amendment to cut the appropriation in two, and leave some \$30,000,000,000 to be added to the amount of money already available, I knew in my heart that that was far more than could possibly be used before the Congress came back into session in January.

The distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] suggested that there be a commission—not a watchdog commission, but a commission to make a study of our entire military needs. If we are to have such a commission, why not have a study made before we appropriate \$60,000,000,000? We are simply locking the door after the horse is stolen.

The senior Senator from North Dakota believes that this appropriation is entirely without reason. It is based upon hysteria. It is based upon a great many other things, which, in the short time I have left to speak, I shall not enumerate.

In any event, I am satisfied that the amendment which I offered to reduce the appropriation down the middle ought to have been adopted. I am just as certain of it as I am that the sun is going to set in the west.

I said a great many other things during the time when I spoke on the adoption of the United Nations Charter. I call attention to one of them once more today. That Charter, which has assisted in getting us into trouble, was recommended at San Francisco when only a single veteran was present. There was no hurry about it, but it was rushed through just as this bill is being rushed through today. The only veteran who was at that meeting was Harold Stassen, and he was the only member of our delegation who joined with Evatt of Australia and demanded that we carry out the Atlantic Charter, which was totally ignored at the time the United Nations Charter was adopted.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] for yielding me 15 minutes. I regret that some of the amendments which I offered were declared out of order. I think the Presiding Officer was perhaps correct in ruling some of them out of order. I regret that the majority of the Senate refused to adopt the 20-percent cut, the 30-percent cut, the 40-percent cut, or the 50-percent cut. In my humble judgment the day will come when the majority of the Senate will regret the action of the Senate.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have listened with keen interest to the remarks of the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] as he analyzed the bill before us and stated his point of view, with respect to the appropriations for the defense of our country and help to the free world. I listened to his comments, in the light of other statements that have been made on the Senate floor, not only by the senior Senator from Ohio but by other Senators. I thought I would take the liberty, in the minutes allotted to me, to quote a few statements that have been made in the Senate, particularly during this year, in the debates on our foreign policy and mutual-security program.

For example, I quote from the address of the senior Senator from Ohio, printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, of February 8, 1951, at page 1164:

In conclusion, let me say that no one is more determined to resist Communist aggression in the world than I am. I think the Russians present a menace to the liberty of the entire world and to our way of life, a menace greater than we have faced before in our history.

Mr. President, the senior Senator from Ohio not only said that on the 8th day of February, but on the 5th day of January 1951, at page 60 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I quote from his speech:

It seems to me that our battle against communism is in fact a world-wide battle and must be fought on the world stage.

Those are impressive statements. They are statements in which I fully concur. We are confronted with the greatest menace in the history of our Republic. The menace is not one that merely falls upon our own shores but is world-wide in its implications. In that regard I agree with the Senator from Ohio, that it is a menace on the world stage. However, I want to say to the Senator from Ohio that we cannot fight it with halfway measures, half-hearted efforts, or indeterminate objectives.

I listened to the senior Senator from Ohio say that the bill before us is a peacetime bill.

But, in the words of Patrick Henry: "Peace! Peace! There is no peace!"

No one has stated oftener than the Senator from Ohio that there is no peace. He has criticized our President for putting us into the war in Korea. I repeat, Mr. President, he has criticized the President for putting us into the war in Korea.

If there is war going on in this world, obviously there is no peace. I am amazed to hear responsible men who are aware of what is going on in the world, say that we are at peace. Some have said that we are in a sort of half war. More have said that we are engaged in a cold war. All of the men who stood at San Francisco and addressed that great conference, our delegates and delegates from the other United Nations, leaders of both political parties repeatedly stated that we are engaged in a great global conflict, a conflict of ideas, a conflict of economies, and a conflict of philosophies. Mr. President, the sad fact is that, judging by the casualty lists, it is also a conflict on the battlefield.

Our objective is peace—it is to that goal that we direct our efforts. Yes, we are striving for peace. That is the objective of our Government and of the free world. That has been the purpose of the Greek-Turkish aid program, and of the Marshall plan. That has been the purpose of the North Atlantic pact; the mutual security program, of our rearmament; and that is the purpose of meeting the aggressive threat and the aggressive power of the Communist satellite forces in Korea. It is our struggle for peace.

Peace. There has been no peace.

To be sure, there have been times when there has been less bloodshed and less physical combat. But that combat has broken out. We are engaged in hostilities. We face a brutal and cunning enemy. The future course of events is unpredictable. But every sign, every indication tells us to be strong—to step up our efforts in mobilization and mutual security.

When the Senator from Ohio says that we are legislating in a period of peace he contradicts his own words. He not only contradicts his own words, but he contradicts the facts of our time. There is no peace. There is no peace in Indochina, where thousands have given their lives. There has been no peace in China itself, where the Communists have taken over. There was no peace in the Greek civil war. There is no peace in Korea. There is no peace in Malaya. All that we can say is so far God Almighty has spared us the catastrophe of an all-out and total war. We do have a limited war in some areas and a cruel relentless cold war in other areas.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] may say that this appropriation is far too great for peacetime, but he is talking about an era and an age which no longer is with us. The day of peace is not yet at hand.

I listened to the senior Senator from Ohio say that if we keep going along in this fashion we will wreck our economy. I know he says it after considered thought. Previously he stated that this struggle with the Soviet Union and her satellites may be a long one. I agree with that statement.

Mr. President, I have in my hand the report published by the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, dated August 1, 1951. It carries the name among others, of the Senator from Ohio [Mr.

TAFT]. What does the report say? I quote from page 27:

Federal defense expenditures for goods and services took about 4.9 percent of gross national product in fiscal 1950; this rose to 7.2 percent in fiscal 1951 and it is estimated at almost 15 percent for 1952; for fiscal 1953 the ratio may rise to over 18 percent. Subsequently the proportion may decline as gross national product increases and defense expenditures taper off. At the peak, therefore, of the defense effort in fiscal 1953, Federal, State, and local expenditures for defense and nondefense activities may total over 26 percent of gross output. Such is approximately the schedule outlined in the First Quarterly Report of the Director of Defense Mobilization.

What else does the report say? It would be a good report for every Senator to read. I hope every one of them reads it. I have read it. It says that in the period of World War II we actually took over 50 percent of our total gross national product for the defense of our country, and we did not wreck our economy.

As long as the state of mind of some people in the country is what has been stated by the Senator from Ohio, then indeed our economy may be threatened. As long as we look upon our efforts and our mobilization as only a peaceful pursuit, we are not in the frame of mind to do the sacrificing, or to have the unity and support that we must have to defend our freedom. To be sure, our economy is threatened, if we seek to rearm and yet do business as usual.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. LONG. Actually, is it not a fact that this Nation has never been prepared for a major war at the time the war broke out, but fortunately when we were engaged in the last two World Wars we had allies who kept the enemy from us until we could get ready, a situation upon which we cannot depend in the future?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is right. He knows that the great tragedy of America again and again has been her lack of preparedness. There can be no excuse for such folly in this critical hour. Our enemies have already engaged our troops in battle.

What is our program today? It is twofold: First of all, it is to tool up our factories so that they can be converted to all-out production. Secondly, it is to provide a minimum security force so that we can resist an initial impact of aggression. It has been well planned, well scheduled, and it is proceeding along surprisingly well in spite of some difficulties that we find throughout the world.

I prefer to take the judgments of those who have been right more times than they have been wrong. I prefer to take the judgment of those who have seen the menace that is upon us, and have seen it early. The Senator from Ohio did not see fit to vote for the North Atlantic Pact. The Senator from Ohio did not vote for the military aid bill. The Senator from Ohio did not see fit to vote for the point 4 amendment. He did not see fit to vote for the ECA con-

ference report in 1950. He says that the Communist menace is world-wide but he does not act according to his admonitions.

Mr. President, I have heard words here today about checking inflation. I want the Senator from Ohio and others to take a look at the voting record on August 21, 1950, when the price and wage stabilization section of the Defense Production Act was under consideration. How did the Senator from Ohio vote? He voted "nay."

Mr. President, if we want to control inflation, it is a job that requires steadfastness and determination to do the job. It requires taxation to put our program on a pay-as-we-go basis. It requires price and wage stabilization. It necessitates strong controls over the economy. Let those who weep new-found tears over the evils of inflation vote and act to check it.

I also say, Mr. President, that if we are to meet communism on a world-wide stage, we had better be strong enough to meet it when it is necessary to do so. There is not one responsible military leader who has not told us that the program that has been outlined by our Government and acted upon by us is a minimum program, predicated on the assumption that we will not be attacked at least before 1953. If we are to meet and check communism on the world stage we must be prepared to win, not to try.

Mr. President, if anything, time is running out.

I see nothing to indicate that the Soviet leaders are becoming lovers of peace. I see nothing to indicate that they are cutting down in the armaments they are providing.

I believe it was the Senator from Louisiana who today, in a colloquy, said that as we judge what is needed in the way of the appropriations we make for our defense, we should also judge what our enemies are doing in the way of armaments.

Five billion dollars extra has been added to the bill, for further appropriations for the Air Force. That amount is now included in the amount of approximately \$25,000,000,000 now carried in the bill for the Air Corps. Yet I have heard statements made to the effect that the equipment of the Air Force may be obsolete because of changes in technical designs. Mr. President, if we wait until we get the last possible piece of technical equipment that is not obsolete, we shall not only lose the war, but we shall lose all hope of continuing to live as human beings.

Of course war is waste, and of course planes will become obsolete, but we are compelled to judge our armed strength by the measuring stick of the strength and power of the enemy.

Mr. President, I submit that the program which has been outlined in this bill is not an extravagant one. It may well be too little. I would rather be on the side of safety and surplus, rather than be on the side of "too little and too late."

In other words, as long as we face a subtle, vicious, and aggressive enemy

that is willing to strike us and involve us in war at any time and at any place, it ill behooves the people of the United States and their elected representatives in the Congress to let down their guard.

We have trouble on our hands. The Russian Communists and their stooges seem to respond basically to displays of strength whenever we demonstrate strength. They are not moved to caution and peace by words. They, as history proves, respect determination and strength.

Mr. President, I conclude by saying that this is not a defense program which will ruin our economy. If we falter or if our economy is weakened it will be because of greed, selfishness, and shortsightedness.

Today our economy is producing at the rate of approximately \$300,000,000,000 a year gross output, and our output is expanding year after year. Our economy has in it an active growth factor. We have an expanding economy.

I submit that if our defense costs us 20 percent of our gross national product, that is a reasonable price to pay for insurance for freedom. I also submit that it will not bankrupt America. There still will be plenty of persons making profits. The farmers will still be able to grow crops and receive a fair price for them. The workers will still receive a reasonably good wage.

To be sure, we will make sacrifices. Some person will have to make a sacrifice to the extent of getting along with three Cadillacs instead of four, or one yacht instead of two, or one country home instead of three; but I think those are sacrifices we can afford to make when we see what happens in Hungary, as the Senator from New York pointed out on this very floor, and when we know what has happened to William Oatis, in Czechoslovakia, and when we know what has happened to Americans and the citizens of other free countries when they have happened to be caught behind the iron curtain. When we see those things and when we see what has happened to Poland and Czechoslovakia, what more, pray God, do we need in order to realize the danger which confronts us?

There will be no America and no free economy unless we act to meet the threat which confronts us.

Mr. President, in my observations—and I have made some little study of this matter—we still are not tightening our belts too much. We still are riding around in good automobiles with rubber tires. We still have refrigerators and gas stoves; we still enjoy a high standard of living. We still have all those things. We have not yet put America to the test.

I submit to you, Mr. President, that it does not do much to build the morale of our country in its hour of trial for some persons to criticize because we are forced to spend large sums of money in order to defend ourselves.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUNT in the chair). The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am sorry, but my time has expired.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, this tremendous appropriation bill, which we shall pass in a few minutes, is one which of course is startling to every American.

I have voted for numerous of the reductions which have been proposed in the items carried by the bill, especially the reductions proposed in regard to the over-all size of the appropriations, because I am convinced in my own mind, from my own observations, that there is in this bill a substantial amount of fat which is not needed for the immediate preparation of our country for its defense.

However, Mr. President, as is so often the case in instances of this kind, representatives of the Army and the Navy have come before our committees and have testified, regarding this bill, "It is essential to the security of the United States."

I hold nothing against the committees for being unable in many instances to go behind such technical advice, indeed I am sympathetic with the committees.

However, Mr. President, I am mindful of the fact that since 1945 we have spent more than \$100,000,000,000 for the Armed Forces of our country. Yet we hear it said by Senators on both sides of the aisle that we are unprepared to meet an enemy. A substantial portion, or more than half, of the \$100,000,000,000, which has been spent for our defense since 1945, and up to the time of the pending proposal, of course, went to pay off debts and obligations remaining from World War II. However, from those payments we obtained reserves of matériel and equipment which should stand us in good stead in the event of another emergency.

The situation up to now and the complete lack of preparation at the time of the beginning of the so-called police action in Korea, which still continues, indicate to me that tremendous waste and extravagance and, yes, luxury exist in the military establishment; but not being a technician, not being an expert in regard to military matters, I confess my inability to put my finger on the places where waste is indulged in and where economies could be effected.

So I am limited to supporting what I believe to be justifiable reductions in the appropriations carried by the bill; and because I do not wish to be derelict by not helping to provide for the necessary defense of my country at this time, I shall be forced to vote for this appropriation bill, although I believe it provides larger appropriations than are necessary.

Mr. President, while we are voting today to strengthen the military preparedness of our country by means of the enactment of this bill, I wish to call attention to another phase of our national defense which is just as essential as guns

for the defense of the United States and the stability of our economy, namely, the agricultural production of the United States. I say to you today, Mr. President, that the agricultural production of the United States, either because of the carelessness or the stupidity or the lack of information on the part of Government allocation agencies, is going to suffer disastrously in the very near future unless steps are taken immediately to correct the mistakes of the past and the failure of the administration to provide the things it is necessary to provide in order to have the essential food and fiber produced.

In the few minutes which are allocated to me at this time, I wish to call attention to the fact that the Secretary of Agriculture, who heads the agency of our Government which is designated to secure, for instance, the steel needed for the production of farm machinery and other industrial items needed for farm operations, has stated no later than the last of August of this year that in order to be able to produce the food and fiber we need for next year, the farm-machinery and the farm-equipment and the farm-container fields need at least 115 percent more steel than they had in 1949. That statement is to be found in a very fancy bulletin, graphically illustrated with charts and so forth, which has been issued by the Secretary of Agriculture. In it he shows what is happening to our agricultural production, how our stocks and reserves are going down, and how badly we need more food and more machinery. Yet as the procurement agency for the raw materials needed for the production of farm machinery and farm equipment, the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Brannan, has not only utterly failed to procure 100 percent of the amount of raw materials procured for that purpose in 1949, but he is now permitting the allocation agencies of the Government to reduce the allocations of steel for farm machinery and the industries producing other farm equipment to a proposed 50 percent of the 1949 allocations, for the last quarter of this year and the first quarter of next year, meaning that next year we shall have less than 50 percent of the farm machinery which the Secretary of Agriculture himself says is needed in order to produce the food and fiber we must have in order to keep our economy strong and able to meet our food requirements.

On the 22d of August of this year the Department of Agriculture issued a release, quoting Mr. Brannan. I shall not read it all, but I shall read the first sentence:

Farmers now need 15 percent more new farm machinery than they received in 1949, and they require 20 percent more repair and replacement parts than were available to them in the same period, according to a survey recently made in all of the agricultural counties of the United States.

Mr. President, I ask that the entire release, together with the tables which it contains, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the release, including the tables, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT
OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING
ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, August 22, 1951.
NATION-WIDE SURVEY REVEALS INCREASED FARM
MACHINERY REQUIREMENTS

Farmers now need 15 percent more new farm machinery than they received in 1949 and they require 20 percent more repair and replacement parts than were available to them in the same period, according to a survey recently made in all of the agricultural counties of the United States. Results of the study were made public today by Secretary of Agriculture Charles F. Brannan, who said that it is being used as the basis for determining 1952 farm-machinery requirements for presentation to the defense production agencies.

"It is obvious that our present rate of farm production must be maintained, and, in some instances increased, if we are to maintain our strong defensive position in food and fiber," Secretary Brannan said. "Essential requirements of agricultural machinery and repair parts must be provided to insure this production. The intensive use of machinery and equipment in all-out production creates an increased need for certain types of new machinery and heightens the demand for most repair parts."

In order to obtain more complete information on producers' needs, the Department, through State and county production and marketing administration farmer committees, recently surveyed all of the Nation's agricultural counties. The Secretary pointed out that each county PMA committee was instructed to take into consideration in its determination of county requirements only immediate needs of farmers—not what they would like to purchase or what they might give as anticipated future needs. State commissioners of agriculture, experiment stations, the Extension Service, and the Bureau of Agricultural Economics assisted in State PMA committees in reviewing and consolidating the county estimates. Further intensive review was made after the surveys reached the Department.

Although the survey shows that an aggregate quantity of new farm machinery and equipment equal to 115 percent of 1949 shipments is needed in 1952, the Secretary emphasized that this does not apply uniformly to all items of equipment. The trend toward use of heavier machinery accounts for a major proportion of the increase, whereas the need of horse-drawn equipment is only 60 to 75 percent of 1949 shipments reflecting the increasing mechanization and continuing decline in animal draft power.

Production adjustment among crops necessary to meet the shifting pattern of food and fiber requirements also are reflected in the results of the surveys. For instance, a substantial increase over 1949 production of cotton pickers and strippers is needed due to major increases in cotton acreage in areas where this machinery is used. At the same time, requirements for potato planting and harvesting equipment are only about 70 percent of 1949 shipments because of smaller acreages now being planted to this crop.

The accelerated movement of workers from farms to factories and to the Armed Forces is shown in increased requirements for such labor-saving machinery as beet harvesters, corn pickers, automatic pick-up balers, cotton harvesters, and forage harvesters. The increasing importance of fertilizer and pesticides to expanded farm production accounts for higher requirements for fertilizer distributors, manure spreaders, and for field and row-crop sprayers and dusters.

A breakdown of the survey, showing present needs for various types of farm equipment, as a percentage of 1949 purchases, follows:

Present needs for farm equipment, as a
percentage of 1949 purchases

Tractor, wheels:	
Light.....	86
Medium.....	110
Heavy.....	123
Tractors, crawler:	
Light.....	106
Heavy.....	115
Tractors, garden type.....	81
Plows:	
Tractor moldboard.....	103
Tractor disk.....	109
Horse-drawn.....	61
One-way disk.....	103
Ditching plows.....	68
Listers:	
Drawn.....	102
Mounted.....	115
Terracers.....	92
Harrows:	
Disk.....	119
Spike tooth.....	104
Spring tooth.....	103
Stalk cutters.....	101
Land levelers and scrapers.....	101
Land rollers:	
Smooth.....	63
Pulverizing.....	101
Grain drills.....	117
Corn and cotton planters.....	117
Potato planters.....	75
Beet and bean drills.....	102
Transplanters.....	112
Lime spreaders.....	92
Fertilizer distributors.....	111
Manure spreaders.....	122
Cultivators:	
Horse-drawn.....	75
Tractor.....	120
Rotary hoes.....	105
Field cultivators.....	97
Sprayers:	
Orchard.....	104
Field crop.....	133
Dusters:	
Orchard.....	83
Field crop.....	131
Grain combines:	
6-inch and under.....	111
Over 6 inches.....	106
Self-propelled.....	112
Grain binders.....	73
Potato diggers.....	72
Beet lifters.....	80
Beet harvesters.....	129
Corn pickers.....	119
Field and forage harvesters.....	129
Cotton pickers.....	260
Cotton strippers.....	1,049
Mowers:	
Tractor-mounted.....	113
Drawn.....	83
Rakes:	
Side delivery.....	136
Sulky.....	75
Balers:	
Stationary.....	58
Pick-up wire.....	126
Pick-up twine.....	125
Farm elevators:	
Portable.....	114
Stationary.....	108
Grain blowers.....	90
Forage blowers.....	114
Threshers:	
Peanut.....	94
Grain.....	61
Corn shellers.....	99
Hammer mills.....	96
Burr mills.....	80
Seed cleaners.....	91
Dryers:	
Portable.....	99
Stationary.....	104
Farm dairy machinery:	
Cream separators.....	91
Milking machines.....	103
Milk coolers.....	103

Present needs for farm equipment, as a percentage of 1949 purchases—Continued

Farm poultry equipment:	
Incubators.....	83
Brooders.....	103
Feeders.....	105
Waterers.....	105
Growing and laying batteries.....	96
Egg-grading and cleaning equipment.....	103
Barn equipment:	
Stalls with stanchions.....	101
Stalls without stanchions.....	94
Barn cleaners.....	112
Stanchions.....	99
Water bowls.....	101
Feed and litter carriers.....	97
Barnyard equipment:	
Feeders.....	103
Stock tanks.....	103
Hog waterers.....	105
Farm wagons and truck:	
Chassis.....	100
Trailer gears.....	98
Boxes, beds, and racks.....	104
Domestic water supply:	
Pumps.....	108
Windmills.....	77
Complete water systems.....	129
Farm irrigation equipment:	
Pipe.....	173
Pumps.....	158
Motors-engines.....	143
Sprinkler systems.....	136
All repair parts.....	120
United States weighted average percent, 114.69.	

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, at the same time the graphic bulletin I have in my hand, a very expensive brochure, was published by the Department of Agriculture in order that people who do not understand technical subjects may easily understand the situation. The bulletin sets forth what this country will need by way of food and fiber next year, in connection with the war effort and otherwise. It then shows what we shall require in the way of farm machinery.

But let me state what has been happening. Under the tender mercies of Mr. Fleischmann, the Administrator of the National Production Authority, the allocations of steel for farm machinery are declining steadily, whereas Mr. Brannan says, as the result of his studies, that we shall need, next year, from 2,700,000 to 3,000,000 tons of steel for the farm-equipment industry and for the production of machinery which the farmers must have. The allocation of steel for that purpose during the third quarter of this year was 673,000 tons, and for the fourth quarter, 528,000 tons, showing a steady reduction. But it is rather notable that in the automobile industry, though some rather unusual influences were brought to bear, I understand, there was an allocation of 1,879,000 tons of steel for motor vehicles in the third quarter. That allocation was made to the American automobile industry. For the fourth quarter of this year there was an allocation of 3,464,000 tons of steel for the same purpose, while there was a reduction in the allocations for the production of farm machinery, which, according to the statement of the Secretary of Agriculture himself, is essential in order to produce the food which we shall need if we are to engage in a war effort or a security effort.

I emphasize, Mr. President, that food is quite as important as guns. I think no one will deny that statement. Yet at the present time, when we are on the verge of another emergency, we are again ill-advisedly cutting down the allocations of the steel required in order to produce food.

Young men are leaving the farms again, as they did in 1942, 1943, and 1944. There are men sitting on this floor at this moment who attended a governors' conference at Des Moines, Iowa, which I called in 1944 because the allocation of farm machinery was declining to such a degree that we were facing almost a complete shortage of food and foodstuffs in great areas. At first the Government—meaning the Department of Agriculture—boycotted the conference. But there were about nine governors from farm States in attendance. We pointed out the lack of realism on the part of Government officials in the allocation not only of steel but of farm machinery for the production of food. I think some good came as a result of the conference. But that was in the middle of the war.

I am calling attention again to the fact that officials of the Department of Agriculture, many of whom do not know a rotary hoe from a corn-picking machine, are again following the same old pattern, saying that food will grow of itself, that somehow it will be harvested of itself, and that somehow there will be enough for the people to eat it, not seeming realize that if we are to have food during this time of emergency, it is necessary to have steel for farm machinery in order to produce binders and pickers and mowers and rakes and harvesters, and all the other implements used on farms. I merely wish to say that I am not only serving notice on Members of the Senate, but that I am also bringing to the attention of the Nation the fact that now is the time to begin to allocate and to furnish sufficient steel to provide farm machinery for next year, unless we are to face a shortage in the crop goals which we must attain according to the figures of the Department of Agriculture itself.

It is interesting to note that every time the military speaks, we of the Congress jump. When it is a question of guns for national defense, we take their word without question. But it is also interesting to note that so far as farming is concerned, all too often the Washington agriculturalists, who do their farming at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue, have the idea that farming is merely something in which nature takes care of the situation, and that in the summertime all one has to do is to be happy and dance, and then harvest the grain, which somehow nature has grown, and in the fall, when the wind is crisp, to pick the corn which nature has provided. They do not realize that farming is an industry and a business which requires planning and programing, which requires machinery, and which requires industry and tremendously hard work in order to produce the necessary food supply of the country. There is also in the picture the fact that people are leaving the farms, attracted, as they always are in times such as these, by the

higher wages and better pay in the war industries. That includes young men who are not called into the Armed Forces. I assure Senators that no particular preference is being given to the farm boys who are going into the service, just as are the city boys. But those who do not go into the Armed Forces are often attracted by the higher wages which prevail in the towns with the result that less labor is left on the farm, which must be implemented by more farm machinery and more equipment, more containers, and all the other things a farmer needs in order to operate his food factory.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Iowa has expired.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I yield the Senator from Iowa 2 minutes of my time.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I thank the Senator from Wyoming, who is always generous and courteous.

The question we are considering is serious, Mr. President. I invite attention to the fact that the officials in Washington should not do as they did in World War II, namely, allocate rotary hoes to Pike County, Colo., where they do not know what a rotary hoe is, and could not use one if they had it. They allocated cornpickers to the South, where they were not needed. They allocated other machinery to the North where there was no need for it. I am saying they had better get busy and exercise some practical common sense if we are to produce the amount of food the Department of Agriculture and every farm group and organization says is necessary in this time of emergency.

I thank the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN].

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, everyone knows where I stand on the question before the Senate. I wish to associate myself with the splendid address of the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. It was clear and eloquent, and represented to an unusually great extent my own thinking on this subject.

Mr. President, we have no choice. In listening to some of the speeches, it would appear that we can design our own course. We cannot. The enemies that threaten the liberties of this country and the liberties of the free world can strike at any time. In my opinion, the only possible way to maintain peace in the world is to make ourselves so strong that we cannot be successfully attacked. In order to accomplish that we must be prepared to make the sacrifices necessarily accompanying the expenditure of large sums of money, and we must strengthen our friends and allies abroad.

We hear much said about inflation, Mr. President. Of course, there is a chance of inflation. That is why I have been so eager, first, to have adequate legislation for the control of prices, and, second, to raise through taxation, burdensome as increased taxation always is, an amount sufficient to keep the impending deficit at least within reasonable limits. I think we must do that, and we must be willing to spend the neces-

sary funds to make ourselves and our allies so strong that we will not be threatened and cannot be successfully attacked.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now recurs on the final passage of the bill. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] is necessarily absent, and was forced to leave the city at 6 o'clock this evening, having been scheduled for several weeks to deliver an address tonight at the annual banquet of the Connecticut Federation of Labor at Bridgeport. I announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut would vote "yea."

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent on official business.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] is absent by leave of the Senate, and, if present, he would vote "Yea."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] would vote "yea."

The Senators from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN and Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are detained on official business. If present and voting the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 79, nays 0, as follows:

YEAS—79

Aiken	Ferguson	Johnson, Tex.
Bennett	Flanders	Johnston, S. C.
Brewster	Frear	Kern
Bricker	Fulbright	Kerr
Butler, Md.	George	Kilgore
Butler, Nebr.	Gillette	Knowland
Cain	Green	Langer
Capehart	Hayden	Lehman
Carlson	Hendrickson	Long
Case	Hennings	Maybank
Clements	Hickenlooper	McCarran
Connally	Hill	McClellan
Cordon	Hoey	McFarland
Dirksen	Holland	McKellar
Douglas	Humphrey	McMahon
Dworshak	Hunt	Millikin
Eastland	Ives	Monroney
Eaton	Jenner	Mocdy
Ellender	Johnson, Colo.	Morse

Mundt	Russell	Thye
Murray	Saltonstall	Underwood
Neely	Schoeppel	Watkins
Nixon	Smathers	Welker
O'Connor	Smith, Maine	Williams
O'Mahoney	Smith, N. J.	Young
Pastore	Smith, N. C.	
Robertson	Stennis	

NOT VOTING—17

Anderson	Kefauver	Sparkman
Benton	Lodge	Taft
Bridges	Magnuson	Tobey
Byrd	Malone	Wherry
Chavez	Martin	Wiley
Duff	McCarthy	

So the bill (H. R. 5054) was passed.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I move that the clerks be authorized to number consecutively the sections which have been added.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the request is granted.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I move also that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. BYRD, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. WHERRY, and Mr. SALTONSTALL conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I also move that the bill be printed with the Senate amendments numbered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That will be done under the order already entered.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, in order that Senators may know what bills the Senate is going to consider, I wish to announce the program.

First, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 4496, making appropriations for the legislative branch.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 4496) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on a motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4496) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I had hoped that we would be able to pass this bill today, but the hour is late, and I think it is better that the Senate go over until tomorrow.

After we pass the legislative appropriation bill we will take up Senate bill 355, the postal pay increase bill, and after that, Senate bill 622, to increase the basic rates of compensation of Federal employees. The next bill will be Senate bill 436, a bill to provide for the separation of subsidy from air-mail pay, which

has been reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I did not catch the numbers of the bills. I wonder if the Senator mentioned the bill involving the President's veto of the veterans' pension, House bill 3193.

Mr. McFARLAND. I have spoken to the distinguished Senator from Georgia on that subject, and it will be agreeable with the Senator to take up that bill at almost any time. I thought probably on Tuesday or Wednesday it could be taken up. On tomorrow I shall be glad to confer with the Senator, and we will work out a unanimous-consent agreement as to time.

Mr. MORSE. Very well.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I had expected that the Senate would convene tomorrow at 10 o'clock in the morning, but I find that a number of committees are meeting tomorrow morning, and that we would not be able to make very much progress by meeting at an earlier hour. It is certainly my hope that we can pass at least two of these bills, and probably three, tomorrow. So we will remain in session until we do so, that is, until we at least pass the legislative appropriation bill and the postal pay bill.

The next bill is, of course, a general salary increase bill of Federal workers, and it should be passed shortly after the other bills are passed.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Would the Senator be willing to express his idea regarding the possibility of a Saturday session, so that Members of the Senate may be informed?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I would prefer that we would start to have some sessions next week beginning at 10 o'clock in the morning, rather than to have a Saturday session.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I wish to ask our leader a question. If we complete action on the legislative appropriation bill tomorrow and proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 622, is it the intention of the majority leader that we then follow action on that bill by taking up Senate bill 355?

Mr. McFARLAND. Senate bill 355 comes second, following the legislative appropriation bill.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I like that procedure. I hope we shall not be sidetracked on something else. Am I correct in understanding that on Monday, if we do not finish with the pending bill, the order will still be the same?

Mr. McFARLAND. No. We shall have to lay these bills aside for the tax bill if it is ready on Monday, but the other bills will immediately follow the tax bill when we dispose of that. It is very important that we pass the tax bill at the earliest possible date in order that it may be sent to conference.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I understand that. If the tax bill is ready it will be taken up, but if the tax bill is not ready, the order of business will be as stated by the Senator.

Mr. McFARLAND. The order which I have stated will be followed.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is my understanding of the suggested procedure correct, that an effort will be made to pass at least two, and possibly three bills tomorrow? Is it the intention of the Senator to continue the session into the evening?

Mr. McFARLAND. I do not want to have too late a session, but probably it may be necessary to run late. Especially we should sit into the evening if we do not pass two of the bills. The two bills are short.

Mr. President, I hope Senators will not make speeches on other matters until we have passed those two bills. I am willing to remain here and listen to speeches, but I do not want the whole Senate to have to remain here and wait for a number of speeches when they could be made after two or three of these bills are passed. If Senators will confer with the minority leader and myself, we will work out a schedule.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSIONS

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the majority leader had announced that next week he expects the sessions of the Senate to begin at 10 o'clock, I ask unanimous consent at this time that the Committee on Banking and Currency be permitted to continue its hearings on the changes in the control bill during sessions of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be allowed to sit until 1 o'clock tomorrow. It is necessary to read, if we have it in printed form, the tax bill for final approval by the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ALLEGED CORRUPTION AND FRAUD IN CONNECTION WITH COMMERCIAL AFFAIRS OF THE NATIONALIST CHINESE REGIME

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the Record at this point as a part of my remarks an article entitled "Nationalists' United States Supplier Tried To Sell to Red China," written by Alfred Friendly and published in the Washington Post of September 12.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

"SQUEEZE"—NATIONALISTS' UNITED STATES SUPPLIER TRIED TO SELL TO RED CHINA

(Fourth in a series)

(By Alfred Friendly)

For at least 2 years the Chinese Nationalists' officially designated supply contractors

have attempted also to sell strategic equipment to the Chinese Reds.

To what degree they have succeeded is not known and can be determined only by further investigation. But there is ample record of how they tried.

The supply organization is headed by a top holding company, Commerce International Corporation, under which is a worldwide network of operating subsidiaries. Among them is Commerce International (China), Inc., or CIC, contractors to the Board of Supplies, Executive Yuan, Republic of China.

It was this company which Lt. Gen. P. T. Mow and Col. Hsiang Wei Hsuan, top officers in the Chinese Air Force mission in Washington, suspected of unscrupulous and dishonest behavior. A fight ensued in the summer and fall of last year. Three weeks ago, Chiang Kaishek ordered the two men recalled to Formosa to face a long series of charges against them.

Another of the top company's subsidiaries or affiliates is Commerce International (U. K.), Ltd., with offices in London. The operating head of it is one Robert H. Dimpfl.

Commerce International (U. K.) has the reputation in London as a concern that will trade in anything with anybody at any time so long as there is a quick and substantial profit in the deal. It is watched carefully by the British Government.

Its chief business is trading in surplus British war material. Only last year the British Board of Trade refused it export licenses when it tried to sell some of the material to Communist China.

One of its most ambitious undertakings had to do with the attempted supply of 78,000 tons of German steel rails to Mao Tse-tung's government, late in 1949.

Originally, the company had given a contract to two of the largest German steel combines, Vereinigte Stahlwerke and Kloeckner's, to supply the rails to Nationalist China. But when the Communists drove the Nationalists off the Asiatic mainland, they happily took over the contract. Commerce International (U. K.) was, apparently, nothing loath to go through with the deal.

There was a flurry of publicity about it in German newspapers in January 1950, and some adverse comment about the British here, because it was thought the contracting company was British and not, as was the fact, the subsidiary of an American firm.

The matter came to the attention of the Allied High Commission for Germany. It first postponed, then prohibited the transaction.

From available evidence, it appears that the Chinese Communists negotiated to obtain the rails through the office which CIC maintained in Shanghai. The company found it could do business with the Communists, and the Communists, in turn, did not attempt for some time to by-pass the American trading company when it wanted to make purchases abroad.

According to Commerce International (U. K.), when interviewed on the subject, rent is still being paid on the Shanghai office, although it is not now functioning. The CIC has for a long period also maintained an office in Hongkong.

Also, from this side of the Atlantic, CIC has sought permission for transactions which have excited lively suspicions on the part of the American Government.

EXPORT LICENSES REFUSED

In 1950 CIC attempted to obtain an American export license to ship to its British affiliate something more than half a million dollars of heavy construction equipment, of a sort to which the Commerce Department applies its highest strategic and security classification. CIC's moving spirit, Vice President S. G. Fassoullis, could not or would not give the Department satisfactory assurances on the ultimate use of the equipment.

The American Embassy in London, checking on the proposed shipment with the company's local man, Dimpfl, also drew a blank.

Dimpfl was unwilling to say what the end use of the material would be, and such assurances as he gave that it would remain in the British Isles were not convincing to the Embassy. The export licenses were therefore refused about a year ago.

The Commerce Department, it is known, has a sizable sheaf of applications by CIC for export licenses which have been turned down. The official reason is that the shipments would not have been in the national interest.

That phrase, it is understood, is used when the Department has good grounds to believe that the proposed shipment will not stay at the destination indicated in the export application, but will be transshipped to Communist China or to countries behind the iron curtain.

UNDER OFFICIAL SCRUTINY

As a result of its experience with CIC, the Commerce Department keeps a special and wary eye peeled for all applications from the company.

It is known that the State Department and Customs Bureau are also maintaining the same sort of careful scrutiny over CIC and entertain the same lack of enthusiasm for its business ethics. Here are some of the reasons:

1. Acting on explicit information supplied by Colonel Hsiang, one of the two recalled Chinese air force officers, the Customs Bureau in September 1950, intercepted and stopped an air shipment by CIC to Formosa of several thousand dollars' worth of airplane parts, for which no export license had been obtained.

Further investigation revealed that at some earlier date CIC had sent out \$1,000 worth of communication parts, also without a license. There is some evidence, however, that this may have been done innocently by west coast employees of CIC who did not know the regulations.

2. About a year ago, Commerce International (U. K.) bought from British sources 108 Bren gun carriers, in very poor condition, obtained from surplus disposal dumps. The company obtained a British export license for them on the representation that they would be shipped to the United States for reconditioning, and thence to the Philippine Islands.

DESTINATION FORMOSA

Actually, however, the intended destination was Formosa. Commerce International (U. K.) did not tell the British this, for the good reason that the British Government refuses export licenses for munitions bound for either Red or Nationalist China.

The cargo of Bren gun carriers arrived in Baltimore last November. Customs Bureau suspicions were aroused when the shippers attempted to obtain a landing permit for the stuff without actually putting it ashore. Such a permit was needed, it appeared, in order to validate the American export license of the company. It may have wanted to avoid the expense of unloading and reloading, but it may also have wanted to escape publicity.

The application for the landing permit said the goods were of American origin. The object, one may assume, was to avoid any American import duties that may have been applicable.

Actually, almost all carriers were British-made.

Customs Bureau suspicions were also heightened by the fact that when Commerce International (U. K.) applied for the American import license, it valued the shipment at about \$7,000. When application was made for the export license, it was valued at a much higher figure. The State Department advised Chinese Embassy officials here that they apparently stood to take a

House of Representatives

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 1951

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most merciful and gracious God, our needs are many but Thy blessings outnumber all our necessities and no aspiration, which Thou hast implanted within our souls, is beyond the reach of fulfillment by Thy infinite wisdom and love.

We pray that at the beginning of this new week we may be inspired with a greater faith in the power of Thy divine sovereignty as we seek to have a share in establishing Thy kingdom of peace and righteousness.

Grant that daily we may surrender ourselves to Thy wise and holy will, not in dumb resignation or in sullen submission but with glad and grateful hearts and giving Thee all the glory.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, September 14, 1951, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Landers, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 355. An act to adjust the salaries of postmasters, supervisors, and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4496. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. SALTONSTALL to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1726) entitled "An act to provide for the organization of the Air Force and the Department of the Air Force, and for other purposes."

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1952

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the

Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4496) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, disagree to the amendments of the Senate and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Mr. McGRATH, Mr. KIRWAN, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. CANNON, Mr. HORAN, Mr. SCHWABE, and Mr. TAYLOR.

SOUTH DAKOTA PRACTICES ECONOMY AND ABOLISHES TEMPORARY TAXES

(Mr. LOVRE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include an article.)

[Mr. LOVRE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of today's RECORD.]

PRESERVING THE CIVIL RIGHTS GUARANTEED BY THE CONSTITUTION

(Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and to include a resolution.)

[Mr. McDONOUGH addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of today's RECORD.]

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5054) making appropriations for the National Security Council, the National Security Resources Board, and for military functions administered by the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, disagree to the amendments of the Senate and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MAHON, SHEPPARD, SIKES, RILEY, CANNON, TABER, WIGGLESWORTH, and SCRIVNER.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBER

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas, Mr. FRANK IKARD, be permitted to take the oath of office. His certificate of election has not yet arrived, but there is no contest and there is no question in regard to his election.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. IKARD appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

AIR FORCE ORGANIZATION ACT OF 1951

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 1726) to provide for the organization of the Air Force and the Department of the Air Force, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of September 14, 1951.)

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, this is the Air Force organization bill which was passed some time ago by the House and more recently, of course, by the Senate.

The conference committee has agreed on substantially the House bill. The major change would be as to the question of the command authority of the Chief of Staff of the Air Force. In the House bill the Chief of Staff was given only supervision of the Air Force such as is possessed by the Chief of Staff of the Army. The provision in the Senate bill gave the Chief of Staff command of the Air Force. The conference committee has agreed to give the Chief of Staff of the Air Force practically the same command authority as is possessed by the Chief of Naval Operations. The Chief of Naval Operations has command of the operational force of the Navy.

In this bill we set out the Air Defense Command, the Strategic Air Command, and the Tactical Air Command as the major air commands of the Air Force and provide for other major commands in an emergency. It will be noted that the three commands designated in the bill as major commands are all combat commands. The conference report gives command to the Chief of Staff of the Air Force of these major commands. So that to all intents and purposes the Chief of Staff of the Air Force under this provision will have the same command function as the Chief of Naval Operations who has command of the operational forces. This gives the Chief of Staff command of the major or combat commands and gives him supervision over all other portions of the Air Force.

The Senate bill contained a provision for the appointment of an officer charged with Air Reserve functions and the conference report retains that provision.

Those are the major changes.

Mr. ARENDS. This is a unanimous report of the conferees?

Mr. KILDAY. That is correct.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE LATE MIDDLETON BEAMAN

(Mr. DOUGHTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes.)

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, it was with sadness of heart that I learned of the death last Saturday night of the distinguished former legislative counsel of the House of Representatives, the late Middleton Beaman. Perhaps the members of the Committee on Ways and Means had an opportunity to work more closely with Mr. Beaman than did other committees, yet I am confident that hardly a single committee chairman, during his 30 years of service as legislative counsel, failed to draw upon his vast knowledge and experience in the preparation of complex legislation.

For all practical purposes, although Middleton Beaman rigidly excluded himself from all policy decisions and considerations of partisanship, he was a full partner in the drafting of all revenue legislation from the Revenue Act of 1917 down to the Revenue Act of 1948. Indeed, in my opinion, one of the greatest contributions the Committee of Ways and Means ever made to the orderly functioning of the House of Representatives was to include in the revenue bill of 1918 provision for the legislative drafting service. The decision to establish the Office of the Legislative Counsel was reached after Mr. Beaman had headed a volunteer group of draftsmen who had served the Committee on Ways and Means in the preparation of the revenue bills of 1917 and 1918 and even prior to that had ably assisted Judge Cordell Hull, of Tennessee, in his work in drafting the Federal estate tax. I believe I can say with assurance that from this time on until his retirement in 1949, no one made a greater impression upon the revenue legislation passed by Congress than did Mr. Beaman.

Perhaps the skill of legislative draftsmen which was possessed by Mr. Beaman in such superlative degree was best described by the English Judge J. Stephen in *Castioni* ((1891) 1 Queen's Bench, 194, 167), who observed that, in drafting acts of Parliament, "which, although they may be easy to understand, people continually try to misunderstand, and in which therefore it is not enough to attain to a higher degree of precision which a person reading in good faith can understand; but it is necessary to attain if possible to a degree of precision which a person reading in bad faith cannot misunderstand. It is all the better if he cannot pretend to misunderstand it."

For this life of public service we all can be grateful. I extend to his beloved wife and sister my deepest sympathy.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER.]

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to work very closely as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means with Mr. Beaman. From that

experience I can assert without fear of contradiction that no individual has contributed more to the work of Congress during his service of more than 30 years as House Legislative Counsel than did Mr. Beaman.

Whatever policies might be agreed upon by the committee whom he was endeavoring to assist, it was the steadfast purpose of his keen mind that that policy should be expressed in statutory language free of ambiguity, and that the legislation should be drafted in such a manner as to withstand any charge of unconstitutionality in the courts.

I have often expressed the conviction that many of the outstanding statutes over the past 20 years have stood the test of constitutionality very largely because of the able assistance given to the Congress by Mr. Beaman. He was one of the greatest lawyers I have ever known. For example, I happened to be a member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Ways and Means for the drafting of the Social Security Act. I shall never forget the contribution made by Mr. Beaman in the drafting of that measure and by following his advice we produced a law affecting all the people of the country which has safely withstood all attacks of unconstitutionality.

I always have regarded Mr. Beaman as one of the most valuable men holding any position in the service of this Government. I extend to his family my deepest sympathy in their great bereavement.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I learned with great sorrow of the death on Saturday of the distinguished authority on statutory law and legislative draftsmanship, the late Middleton Beaman. I think that few people have given so much of their talents and energies to the work of the Congress as did Mr. Beaman.

Soon after his graduation from Harvard University and admission to the bar, he came to Washington to serve as law librarian of Congress. Then, after a few years spent in research in legislative drafting, he returned as the head of a voluntary group of experts to demonstrate to Congress the value of expert technical assistance in the drafting of legislation. He assisted the committees so effectively in the preparation of legislation during the period of World War I that in 1919, largely as a result of his efforts, Congress created the Office of the Legislative Counsel. In fact, the decision of the Committee on Ways and Means to establish the legislative drafting service as a provision of the revenue bill of 1918 was reached only upon the understanding that Mr. Beaman should be appointed the head of the House branch of that office, and that the services to be rendered would continue to be of the same kind and quality as the committee had been furnished in connection with the revenue bills of 1917 and 1918.

The wisdom of that decision has been demonstrated by the clarity of the drafting of the many complicated revenue measures, the social security laws, and the many other complex statutes of the

past 30 years which have stood the test of litigation in the Federal courts.

Mr. Beaman's work is his monument. I extend to his bereaved family my heart-felt sympathy.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am very sorry to hear of the death of Mr. Beaman. For 10 years I served on the Committee on Ways and Means. By reason of my service thereon I was afforded an opportunity and a pleasure to meet and know Mr. Beaman. He was one of the outstanding officials of our Government, a man of sterling qualities, outstanding ability, honorable and trustworthy in every respect. Not only the Committee on Ways and Means, but every other committee depended upon his advice and suggestions and viewed them with profound respect.

The deep respect I have for him is a memory that I shall always treasure as long as I live, a respect based upon his sterling qualities as well as his sincerity of service to the Congress of the United States and to our Government. I extend to his loved ones my deep sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I have just a few words to say. Mr. Beaman possessed a quality of mind that was very superior. His mind was very incisive and clear. He had the mental facility for clear, positive, and unambiguous statement that was possessed by few men. Besides being a man of high character, his great and outstanding accomplishments, in my opinion, came from the fact that he had very superior mental qualifications. He will always be remembered by those who knew him here in Congress as a man who filled a most difficult position with great credit to himself and great satisfaction to those with whom he worked. He was the technical adviser for the Ways and Means Committee on its very complicated work in the writing of tax legislation and social security and other legislation which was most difficult to write.

His wife and his family can always be proud of his ability and his achievement.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who so desire may extend their remarks at this point in the Record on the life and services of the late Middleton Beaman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, Middleton Beaman was the first member of the legislative counsel to appear on Capitol Hill. His has always been an outstanding service. Mr. Beaman was a man of high character and splendid ability. He really served well and faithfully.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

RADIO BROADCASTING

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce: Resumed its executive consideration of S. 658, amending the Communications Act of 1934, amending organizational, procedural, and appellate sections (relative to issuance and revocation of radio broadcasting licenses). Recessed until tomorrow morning.

IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

Committee on the Judiciary: Walter Subcommittee No. 1 approved for reporting to the full committee H. R. 401, providing that any person not a citizen and regardless of age, who serves with the Armed Forces on or after June 25, 1950, and not later than June 30, 1952, may be naturalized after compliance with the naturalization laws. Also approved 18 private immigration bills (12 of the House and 6 of the Senate), and reported adversely on 6 other private immigration bills (5 of the House and 1 of the Senate).

FISH AND GAME

Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries: Boykin Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife approved for reporting to the full committee S. 509, amending the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act of 1934 so as to permit a larger share of the migratory-bird conservation fund (the duck-stamp fund) to be used for enforcement and administrative purposes. Witnesses heard on this bill were Donald J. Chaney, Chief Counsel, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior; Charles Callison, National Wildlife Institute; J. B. Trefethen, Wildlife Management Institute; and Michael Hudoba, editor of Sports Afield.

Another bill to be approved was S. 467, authorizing exchange of wildlife refuge lands within the State of Minnesota. This was reported in lieu of the companion bill, H. R. 3865, which has been considered by the subcommittee. W. T. Krummes, Assistant Chief, Branch of Refuges, Interior Department, was heard on this measure.

Chairman Boykin announced that an explanatory report will be made to the full committee in connection with H. R. 1870, to amend the Act for the Protection of the Bald Eagle in order to include the Territory of Alaska.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 3

(All meetings are open unless otherwise designated)

Senate

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, executive, on calendar, 10:30 a. m., 324 Senate Office Building.

Committee on Appropriations, executive, to mark up H. R. 5215, supplemental appropriations, 10:30 a. m., room F-37, Capitol.

PACIFIC NORTHWEST POWER

Committee on Public Works: Concluded hearings on H. R. 4963, to authorize construction and maintenance of certain fuel-fired electric generating plants in order that the Department of the Interior may meet certain defense power requirements in the Pacific Northwest. Final witnesses to testify were Representative Jackson of Washington, author of the proposed legislation; Robert Hatfield, Vice Chairman and executive assistant to the Chairman of the Munitions Board, Department of Defense; and the following representatives of southwestern utility companies: Hamilton Moses, of the Arkansas Light Gas Co.; and Messrs. Leonard and Siegel, of the Gulf Utilities Corp. Executive consideration of the bill will be given by the committee tomorrow morning, along with H. J. Res. 337, a new measure regarding the St. Lawrence seaway.

Joint Committee Meetings

APPROPRIATIONS—ARMY CIVIL FUNCTIONS

Conferees met again in executive session to work out differences between the House- and Senate-passed versions of H. R. 4386, Army civil-functions appropriations for 1952, but did not conclude. They meet again tomorrow.

POSTAL RATES

Conferees met in executive session to explore the differences between the House- and Senate-passed versions of S. 1046, to readjust postal rates, but took no action. They meet again tomorrow.

APPROPRIATIONS—ARMED SERVICES

Conferees, in executive session, agreed to file a conference report on the differences between the House- and Senate-passed versions of H. R. 5054, defense appropriations for 1952.

TAX REVISION

Conferees met in executive session to begin working out differences between the House- and Senate-passed versions of H. R. 4473, tax-revision bill, but made no announcement of action taken. They will meet again tomorrow.

Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, Investigations Subcommittee, on Lithofold Corp. investigation, 11 a. m., 357 Senate Office Building.

Committee on Foreign Relations, subcommittee, on nomination of Philip Jessup to be Delegate to U. N. General Assembly, with Senator McCarthy, 10 a. m., 312 Senate Office Building.

Committee on the Judiciary, executive, on nomination of Frieda B. Hennock to be U. S. district judge for southern district of New York, 10 a. m., 424 Senate Office Building.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, executive, on S. 1347, railroad retirement, 10 a. m., room F-42, to be followed by

executive meeting of Subcommittee on Labor and Labor-Management Relations, 140 Senate Office Building.

Committee on Rules and Administration, hearings on amendments to cloture rule (S. Res. 41, 52, 105, 203), 10 a. m., 104-B Senate Office Building.

House

Committee on Armed Services, Kilday special subcommittee, to further discuss H. R. 5169, to provide benefits for survivors of members of the uniformed services, executive, 10 a. m., 304 Old House Office Building.

Hébert Subcommittee on Procurement, executive, 10 a. m., 313-A Old House Office Building.

Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, full committee, in executive session, 10 a. m., 1501 New House Office Building.

Bonner Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, executive, 2:30 p. m., 1015 New House Office Building.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Regan Subcommittee on Mines and Mining, on H. R. 4752, amending provisions of the mineral leasing laws to eliminate the waiver of rentals for oil and gas leases for the second and third lease years when a valuable deposit of oil or gas is not discovered on the land during such period, 10 a. m., 1324 New House Office Building.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, on S. 658, to amend the Communications Act of 1934, amending organizational, procedural, and appellate sections (relative to issuance and revocation of radio broadcasting licenses), executive, 10 a. m., 1334 New House Office Building.

Special Subcommittee on Newsprint, to continue public hearings pursuant to H. Res. 116, newsprint study; testimony will be presented by Representative McDonough and Byron D.

Woodside, Director, Defense Expansion Division, DPA, 2 p. m., 1334 New House Office Building.

Committee on the Judiciary, Byrne Subcommittee No. 2, on private claims bills, 10 a. m., 327 Old House Office Building.

Committee on Public Works, on H. R. 4963, relating to construction and maintenance of fuel-fired electric generating plant in Pacific Northwest, and H. J. Res. 337, a new resolution regarding the St. Lawrence seaway, executive, 10 a. m., 1302 New House Office Building.

Committee on Rules, to consider rules for S. 1959, to amend the NIRA, validating certain elections and concerning requirement of union shop preference vote; H. R. 5505, Customs Simplification Act of 1951; and H. R. 5426, Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1951. Will also consider H. Res. 360, creating a select committee to investigate the withdrawal of Federal recognition and the deactivation of certain units of the Illinois National Guard, 2 p. m., room G-12, Capitol. Executive session will be conducted on pending bills and resolutions following open meeting on above-listed measures.

Committee on Ways and Means, King Subcommittee on Administration of the Internal Revenue Laws, to hear the Commissioner of Internal Revenue John B. Dunlap, on the causes for recently revealed irregularities in collectors' offices throughout the country, 9:30 p. m., 1102 New House Office Building.

Joint Committees

Conferees, executive, on H. R. 4386, Army civil-functions appropriations, 2 p. m., room F-37, Capitol.

Conferees, executive, on S. 1046, postal rates, 10:30 a. m., room P-38, Capitol.

Conferees, executive, on H. R. 4473, tax bill, 10 a. m., room P-63, Capitol.

ance to friendly nations in the interest of international peace and security."

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina and Mr. LANGER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 52-8.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATION ACT, 1952

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill (H. R. 5054) making appropriations for the National Security, the National Security Resources Board, and for military functions administered by the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

HOOR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet tomorrow at 10 o'clock a. m.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. KENNEDY, until November 15, on account of official business.

THIRTY-SECOND REPORT TO CONGRESS ON LEND-LEASE OPERATIONS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 227)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting herewith the thirty-second report to Congress on lend-lease operations, for the period from April 1, 1950, to March 31, 1951, inclusive.

During the period covered by this report, a supplement to the lend-lease settlement arrangement of April 15, 1948, was signed with Brazil and final settlement commitments were signed with Colombia, Costa Rica, and Mexico, while Bolivia, Ecuador, and El Salvador liquidated the amounts which were outstanding on their lend-lease accounts incurred within the terms of their respective lend-lease agreements.

The major development in lend-lease activities during this period was the resumption on January 15, 1951, of formal across-the-table negotiations with representatives of the U. S. S. R. In preparation for these negotiations, the Secre-

tary of State discussed with me the major points involved and I approved his recommendations, the objectives of which are just and reasonable compensation to the United States for the civilian-type lend-lease supplies remaining on hand in the Soviet Union at the end of the war; the return to the United States, pursuant to a request submitted in accordance with the provisions of the master lend-lease agreement, of those defense articles transferred to the U. S. S. R. under lend-lease procedures which I have determined to be useful to our Government; and the payment by the U. S. S. R. of satisfactory compensation to United States owners of patented processes which are being used in the U. S. S. R. in oil refineries supplied under the lend-lease program. Despite the continued efforts of the United States negotiators to reach a satisfactory settlement, no substantial agreement on several of the major issues has yet been achieved. These negotiations are described more fully in the report itself.

Other lend-lease activities during the period covered by this report include negotiations for settlements with other countries and, also, the management of fiscal, administrative, and policy matters arising from and related to the lend-lease settlements which already have been concluded with certain of our allies of World War II.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, October 3, 1951.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 97. An act to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of facilities for generating hydroelectric power at the Cheatham Dam on the Cumberland River in Tennessee; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 466. An act to authorize and direct the Administrator of General Services to transfer to the Department of the Army certain property in St. Louis, Mo.; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

S. 582. An act for the relief of Emma Burr; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 590. An act for the relief of Francesco Gaber; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 606. An act for the relief of Fede Vita Guzzardi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 634. An act for the relief of Stela S. Ransler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 635. An act for the relief of Hans Lenk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 659. An act for the relief of Ritsuko Chojin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 702. An act for the relief of Joseph Emanuel Winger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 715. An act for the relief of Ana Cobo Alonso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 781. An act to provide more efficient dental care for the personnel of the United States Army and the United States Air Force; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 905. An act for the relief of Margaret A. Ushkova-Rosanoff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 970. An act for the relief of Esther V. Worley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1048. An act for the relief of Myrtle Harding; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1158. An act for the relief of Takako Kitamura Dalluge; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1177. An act for the relief of Misako Konoshita; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1199. An act for the relief of Julie Nicola Frangou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1274. An act for the relief of Vera Oumancoff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1283. An act to remove the limitation on the numerical strength of the White House Police force; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1342. An act to amend acts relating to garagekeepers and liverymen's liens and the enforcement thereof in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1411. An act to authorize the Postmaster General to issue duplicate checks without requiring bond when such checks of the Post Office Department are lost while in the custody of the United States or lost without fault of owner or holder; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 1415. An act to amend section 7 of the War Claims Act of 1948; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1421. An act for the relief of Masako Sugiyama; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1450. An act to provide for the exchange of certain lands owned by the United States of America for certain privately owned lands; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 1464. An act for the relief of Peter Therkelsen Kirwan and Ernest O'Gorman Kirwan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1517. An act to amend the act of June 4, 1897, entitled "An act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1898, and for other purposes," as amended, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to sell without advertisement national-forest timber in amounts not exceeding \$2,000 in appraised value; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 1541. An act for the relief of Dr. Francis S. N. Kowk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1629. An act to amend the act of May 29, 1884, as amended, to permit the interstate movement, for immediate slaughter, of domestic animals which have reacted to a test for paratuberculosis or which, never having been vaccinated for brucellosis, have reacted to a test for brucellosis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 1640. An act for the relief of Cathy Dana Besser; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1686. An act for the relief of Albert Goldman, postmaster at New York, N. Y.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1800. An act for the relief of Dr. Jacob Griffel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1899. An act to further define the national transportation policy; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1952. An act to amend or repeal certain Government property laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

S. 1967. An act to amend or repeal certain laws relating to Government records, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

S. 1970. An act for the relief of Louis E. Gabel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2007. An act for the relief of Sharon A. Gates; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2025. An act to amend section 9 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 785), to increase the amount available as an emergency relief fund for the repair or reconstruction of highways and bridges damaged by floods or other catastrophes; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 2027. An act for the relief of Leo Kieve; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2079. An act to authorize the contribution of \$12,000,000 to the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

S. 2091. An act to amend the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended, to repeal the provisions therein for additional subscriptions on behalf of the United States to the capital stock of the Federal land banks; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 2128. An act to provide for the merger of two or more national banking associations and for the merger of State banks with national banking associations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 2158. An act for the relief of Michiyo Chiba; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. J. Res. 104. Joint resolution to assist in the rehabilitation of the economy of South Korea, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. J. Res. 290. Joint resolution providing for the recognition and endorsement of the World Metallurgical Congress.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1183. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the construction, protection, operation, and maintenance of public airports in the Territory of Alaska," as amended.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did the following dates present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On October 2, 1951:

H. R. 579. An act for the relief of Hendryk Kempiski;

H. R. 580. An act for the relief of Kwang Myeng Chu;

H. R. 662. An act for the relief of William O. Stevens;

H. R. 676. An act for the relief of Mrs. Almee Hoyningen-Huene;

H. R. 710. An act for the relief of Mrs. Suzanne Chow Hsia and her son, Sven Erik Hsia;

H. R. 711. An act for the relief of George Lukes;

H. R. 744. An act for the relief of Wladimir Peter Lewicki; Mrs. Heedwige Lewicki, and George Wladimir Lewicki;

H. R. 804. An act for the relief of Sisters Maria DeRubertis, Agnese Cerina, Marianna Bonifacio, Dina Bonini, and Edvige Gasparini;

H. R. 901. An act to provide for the admission of Janet and Daisy Wong to the United States;

H. R. 1102. An act for the relief of Emilio Torres;

H. R. 1128. An act for the relief of Harvey McFarland and Laurence Anthony Warneck;

H. R. 1136. An act for the relief of Sister Natalie (Marie Palagyi) and Sister Alice (Elizabeth Slachta);

H. R. 1203. An act to authorize officers designated by the Secretary of the Air Force to take action on reports of survey and vouchers pertaining to Government property;

H. R. 1253. An act for the relief of Jack A. Witham;

H. R. 1420. An act for the relief of Dr. Eugen Jose Singer and Mrs. Frieda Singer;

H. R. 1463. An act for the relief of David Lee Harrigan;

H. R. 1598. An act for the relief of Hanoh Sarapanovschi (also known as Hanoh Charat), Gizela (Gizele) Sarapanovschi (nee Levy) and Philippe Sarapanovschi;

H. R. 1816. An act for the relief of Shomon Takano;

H. R. 1818. An act for the relief of Hego Fuchino;

H. R. 2165. An act for the relief of Matthew Terry;

H. R. 2444. An act for the relief of James A. Vines;

H. R. 2459. An act for the relief of Ollie O. Evans, Jr.;

H. R. 2498. An act for the relief of Marianne and Michel Speelman;

H. R. 2562. An act amending section 437 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code;

H. R. 2621. An act for the relief of Mrs. Giulia Di Gaetano Coccia;

H. R. 2745. An act to amend section 2801 (c) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code;

H. R. 2807. An act for the relief of Stanislaw Poborski;

H. R. 2916. An act for the relief of Shizu Terauchi Parks;

H. R. 3026. An act for the relief of Joseph A. Ferrari;

H. R. 3128. An act for the relief of Elaine Dovico;

H. R. 3436. An act authorizing vessels of Canadian registry to transport grain between United States ports on the Great Lakes during 1951;

H. R. 3585. An act to authorize and direct the Administrator of General Services to transfer to the Department of the Navy certain property located at Decatur, Ill.;

H. R. 3818. An act for the relief of Yutaka Nakaeda;

H. R. 3895. An act for the relief of Ethel Cristeta Berner;

H. R. 3932. An act to provide vocational rehabilitation training for veterans with compensable service-connected disabilities who served on or after June 27, 1950;

H. R. 3965. An act for the relief of five sisters of the Franciscan Missionaries of Mary;

H. R. 4121. An act for the relief of Rafael Alemany;

H. R. 4127. An act for the relief of Mrs. Doris Ellen Young;

H. R. 4463. An act for the relief of Nadine Carol Heslip;

H. R. 4688. An act for the relief of Cecelia Wahls; and

H. R. 4756. An act for the relief of George Francis Hammers.

On October 3, 1951:

H. R. 5013. An act to authorize the President to proclaim regulations for preventing collisions at sea; and

H. J. Res. 290. Joint resolution providing for the recognition and endorsement of the World Metallurgical Congress.

THE LATE HON. KARL STEFAN

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the Giver of all life has placed his hand on one of our number and has said: Come here, my son, your labors are over. Enter into the reward that I have prepared for you.

His passing from our midst has torn our hearts with grief and we miss him greatly. He was such a gentle, kindly, loyal, and good man. It is difficult to announce that the Honorable KARL STEFAN died at the George Washington Hospital in the city of Washington on Tuesday afternoon, October 2, 1951.

The rise of KARL STEFAN and his election to Congress is an inspiring story of what can happen in this Republic. He was born on March 1, 1884, on a farm near Zebrakov, Bohemia, and immi-

grated to the United States in 1885. His parents settled in Omaha, Nebr., where KARL attended the public schools. Later he went to night school. He was successful in all his many undertakings including that of telegraph operator, news writer, reporter, editor, radio news commentator, and businessman.

KARL STEFAN was a resident of Norfolk, Nebr. There he lived a full life, and faithfully served his fine family, his church, his community, his State, and his Nation.

From 1904 to 1906, KARL STEFAN served in the Philippine Constabulary. He served in the Illinois National Guard and later was a lieutenant in the Nebraska National Guard. During World War I, he served his country as a radio code instructor. In World War II, he as a Member of this House not only carried the heavy responsibilities of a Representative but gave effective help in the prosecution of the war, particularly in reference to the Philippine Islands.

Mr. STEFAN was indeed a great citizen, soldier, and statesman, but more than that he was an exemplary husband and father and a Christian gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, to enumerate the contributions that KARL STEFAN has made as a Member of this body would take much time for it is spread on many pages of the RECORD through the years that he served here. He will be remembered for his regular attendance, his detailed knowledge, his clear understanding, and his great ability as a legislator. He was the master of many languages and was a world traveler. These fitted him for the task to which he was assigned. He was a helpful consultant to the Government of the United States in the formation of the United Nations, in the recent Japanese Peace Conference, and on many other occasions. He expressed his love for his country by rendering able and distinguished service for it. Of him can truthfully be said:

Statesman, yet a friend of truth. Of soul sincere,
In action faithful, and in honor clear;
Who broke no promise, served no private ends.

KARL STEFAN is survived by his wife, Mrs. Ida Stefan, and their two children, Dr. Karl Franklin Stefan and Mrs. Ida Mae Askren. To them we extend our deepest sympathy and point them to the words of the Master, "Let not your heart be troubled, ye believe."

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed difficult for me to say the things that I would like to say about our departed friend and colleague, KARL STEFAN. Yesterday the book of life's activities for KARL STEFAN was closed. He passed beyond that veil that holds the answers to many mysteries of life. He has crossed the stage of life and disappeared behind the dark and mysterious curtain of eternal night. Yes, he has set forth to that mysterious land from "whence no traveler returneth."

Yesterday I stood at his bedside. There was a deathless silence filling the room. I could not help but feel that there was someone else in that room. I

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

OCTOBER 4, 1951.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. MAHON, from the committee of conference, submitted the following

CONFERENCE REPORT

[To accompany H. R. 5054]

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5054) making appropriations for the National Security Council, the National Security Resources Board, and for military functions administered by the Department of Defense, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 5, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 36, 37, 38, 40, 42, 43, 53, 55, and 56.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 34, 35, 44, 47, 51, and 52, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$14,100,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: : *Provided, That no part of such sum shall be used to pay the retired or retirement pay of any commissioned member of the*

Regular Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Air Force who is voluntarily retired after the date of enactment of this Act, unless such member was retired because of (1) being unfit to perform the duties of his office, rank, grade, or rating by reason of a physical disability incurred in line of duty, or (2) achieving the age at which retirement is required by law, or (3) whose application is approved in writing by the Secretary of Defense stating that the retirement is in the best interests of the service, or, is required to avoid cases of individual hardship; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

EXPANSION OF UNITED STATES AIR POWER

For the purpose of providing continuous expansion of United States air power by providing additional construction of aircraft and related procurement, Department of the Navy, \$333,000,000; and by providing additional aircraft and related procurement, Department of the Air Force, \$667,000,000.

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert : *Provided further, That until July 1, 1952, further collection by the Comptroller General of the United States or government accountable officers shall not be made on account of payments for accrued leave to enlisted members discharged for the purpose of immediate reenlistment; and the Senate agree to the same.*

Amendment numbered 6: \

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: : *Provided, That none of the funds appropriated in this Act, and none of the property procured therewith, shall be available for transfer to any working capital fund under clothing and equipage in the Department of the Army under section 405 (d) of the National Security Act, as amended; and the Senate agree to the same.*

Amendment numbered 7:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$193,000,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert : *Provided, That expenditures of appropriations contained in this Act for public informational activities of the Department of Defense shall not exceed \$10,950,000 including pay and allowances of military personnel assigned to such activities: Provided further, That none of the funds appropriated in this Act shall be used for expenditure in connection with recruitment advertising including sponsorship of radio and television shows by the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy or the Department of the Air Force;* and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$8,076,056,-430; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$1,775,000-000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following:

For the continuation of the construction of four projects authorized by Public Law 910, Eighty-first Congress, approved January 6, 1951, and Public Law 43, Eighty-second Congress, approved May 31, 1951, to remain available until expended, \$187,300,000 of which \$85,000,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority heretofore granted under this heading to enter into contracts.

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 45:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$19,043,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

(b) No part of any appropriation contained in this Act for "Pay and allowances" of military personnel shall be expended for the pay or allowances, accruing after November 30, 1951, of any enlisted member of the inactive or volunteer reserve who served on active duty for a period of twelve months or more in any branch of the Armed Forces during the period beginning December 7, 1941, and ending September 2, 1945, if such member shall have served on active duty for a period of sixteen months or more after June 26, 1950, unless such member shall have voluntarily consented to remain on active duty.

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 48:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 48, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert: Provided, That no appropriation contained in this Act, and no funds available from prior appropriations to component departments and agencies of the Department of Defense, shall be used to pay tuition or to make other payments to educational institutions in connection with the instruction or training of file clerks, stenographers, and typists receiving, or prospective file clerks, stenographers, and typists who will receive compensation at a rate below the minimum rate of pay for positions allocated to grade GS-5 under the Classification Act of 1949, as amended; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 49;

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

SEC. 628. No appropriation contained in this Act shall be available on and after January 1, 1952, in connection with the operation of commissary stores of the agencies of the Department of Defense for the cost of purchase (including commercial transportation in the United States to the place of sale but excluding all transportation outside the United States) and maintenance of operating equipment and supplies and for the actual or estimated cost of utilities as may be furnished by the Government and of shrinkage, spoilage, and pilferage of merchandise under the control of such commissary stores, except as authorized under regulations promulgated by the Secretaries of the military departments concerned, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense, which regulations shall provide for reimbursement therefor to the appropriations concerned and, notwithstanding any other provision of law, shall provide for the adjustment of the sales prices in such commissary stores to the extent necessary to furnish sufficient gross revenue from sales of commissary stores to make such reimbursement: Provided, however, That under such

regulations as may be issued pursuant to this section all utilities may be furnished without cost to the commissary stores outside the continental United States and in Alaska.

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 54:

That the House reeode from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

SEC. 633. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be available for the payment of flight pay to personnel whose actual assigned duties do not involve operational or training flights.

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 57:

That the House reeode from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 57, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the figures inserted by said amendment insert $63\frac{1}{4}$; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendment numbered 50.

GEORGE MAHON,
HARRY R. SHEPPARD,
ROBERT L. F. SIKES,
JOHN J. RILEY,
CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
ERRETT P. SCRIVNER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
CARL HAYDEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
DENNIS CHAVEZ,
HOMER FERGUSON,
STYLES BRIDGES,
KENNETH S. WHERRY,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5054) making appropriations for the National Security Council, the National Security Resources Board, and for military functions administered by the Department of Defense, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

Amendment No. 1, relating to salaries and expenses, Office of the Secretary of Defense: Appropriates \$14,100,000 instead of \$13,800,000 as proposed by the House and \$14,450,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 2, relating to retired pay: Limits the provisions of the amendment to "commissioned" members of the Regular Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Air Force who are "voluntarily" retired, or to those whose application for retirement is approved in writing by the Secretary of Defense in the best interest of the service, or to avoid cases of individual hardship, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 3, relating to an emergency fund for the construction of aircraft and related procurement: Provides funds in the amount of \$333,000,000 for transfer to the appropriation "Construction of aircraft and related procurement," Department of the Navy, and \$667,000,000 for transfer to the appropriation "Aircraft and related procurement," Department of the Air Force, as proposed by the House.

The purpose of this amendment is to provide an additional fund for the procurement of aircraft and related procurement in order that there will be sufficient funds to place orders for long lead time procurement. This amount should be sufficient to enable the departments concerned to make any necessary procurements for the next few months, when proper presentations can be made to the Congress for further consideration of the entire procurement problem.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Amendment No. 4, relating to pay of the Army: Prohibits until July 1, 1952, the further collection of payments for accrued leave that have been made to enlisted members discharged for the purpose of immediate reenlistment for an indefinite period, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 5, relating to clothing and equipage: Appropriates \$1,506,681,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$1,639,081,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 6, relating to clothing and equipage: Prohibits use of funds in this act for working capital funds under clothing and equipage in the Department of the Army.

The committee desires that a complete report be made under all working capital funds in the different services to the Committees on Appropriation of the House of Representatives and the Senate semi-annually, and so directs.

Amendment No. 7, relating to incidental expenses of the Army: Appropriates \$193,000,000 instead of \$187,914,000 as proposed by the House and \$194,514,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 8, relating to incidental expenses of the Army: Prohibits the use of funds appropriated in this act for expenditures for recruitment advertising, including radio and television shows. Examination of this matter will be the subject of further consideration.

Amendments Nos. 9 and 10, relating to Transportation Service, Army: Appropriates \$968,515,000 as proposed by the House instead of—

\$938,515,000 for expenditure during fiscal year 1952 and thereafter during 1953 and \$30,000,000 for expenditure during fiscal year 1953 for the purposes authorized in this paragraph—

as proposed by the Senate.

The bill as passed by the House included funds in several instances for procurements in excess of the procurements that might be made during fiscal year 1952. This was done for the purpose of providing authority to the departments to enter into long lead time procurements, a portion of which would not be delivered and require payment therefor until after the end of fiscal year 1952. The Senate proposed to separate the amounts required for expenditure during fiscal year 1952 from those that would be required thereafter in order to make clear that the total sum appropriated would not flow into the stream of purchasing power during fiscal year 1952. That purpose, we think, has been clearly established in the publicity that has been given the matter. The Senate concurs in the proposal to return to the House position.

Amendments Nos. 11 and 12, relating to the Signal Service of the Army: Appropriates \$1,213,707,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$817,931,000 and \$400,000,000 as proposed by the Senate with same explanation as given under amendments Nos. 9 and 10 above.

Amendments Nos. 13 and 14, relating to Medical and Hospital Department: Appropriates \$269,580,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$259,580,000 and \$10,000,000 as proposed by the Senate with same explanation as given under amendments Nos. 9 and 10 above.

Amendments Nos. 15 and 16, relating to Engineer Service, Army: Appropriates \$1,166,049,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$1,126,049,000 and \$40,000,000 as proposed by the Senate with same explanation as given under amendments Nos. 9 and 10 above.

Amendments Nos. 17 and 18, relating to Ordnance Service and Supplies, Army: Appropriates \$8,307,500,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$3,332,082,430 and \$4,743,974,000 as proposed by the Senate with explanation as given under amendments Nos. 9 and 10 above.

Amendments Nos. 19 and 20, relating to Chemical Service, Army: Appropriates \$122,560,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$102,560,000 and \$20,000,000 as proposed by the Senate with same explanation as given under amendments Nos. 9 and 10 above.

Amendment No. 21, relating to salaries, Office of the Secretary of the Army: Appropriates \$3,723,400 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$3,625,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 22, relating to salaries, Office of the Judge Advocate General: Appropriates \$743,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$700,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 23, relating to salaries, Office of the Quartermaster General: Appropriates \$9,875,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$9,625,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 24, relating to salaries, Office of the Chief of Transportation: Appropriates \$4,024,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$3,800,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 25, relating to salaries, Office of Chief of Ordnance: Appropriates \$6,750,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$6,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 26, relating to salaries, Department of the Army: Limits the expenditures for salaries, Department of the Army, to 95 percent of the amount appropriated in the specific items for salaries.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Amendments Nos. 27, 28, and 29, relating to construction of aircraft and related procurement: Appropriates \$4,000,000,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$1,050,000,000 and \$2,950,000,000 as proposed by the Senate with same explanation as given under amendments Nos. 9 and 10 above.

Amendments Nos. 30 and 31, relating to shipbuilding and conversion: Appropriates \$1,343,297,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$245,040,000 and \$1,098,257,000 as proposed by the Senate with same explanation as given under amendments Nos. 9 and 10 above.

Amendments Nos. 32 and 33, relating to ordnance for shipbuilding and conversion: Appropriates \$431,390,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$75,000,000 and \$356,390,000 as proposed by the Senate with same explanation as given under amendments Nos. 9 and 10 above.

Amendment No. 34, relating to public works: Appropriates \$51,657,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$50,414,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 35, relating to public works: Provides that \$1,243,000 of the appropriation mentioned above in amendment No. 34 be used for construction at Newport, R. I., as proposed by the Senate.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

Amendments Nos. 36, 37, and 38, relating to aircraft and related procurement: Appropriates \$11,215,800,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$3,215,800,000 and \$8,000,000,000 as proposed by the Senate with explanation the same as given under amendments Nos. 9 and 10 above.

Amendments Nos. 39 and 40, relative to major procurement other than aircraft: Appropriates \$1,775,000,000 instead of \$1,750,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,000,000,000 and \$800,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, with explanation as given under amendments Nos. 9 and 10, above.

Amendment No. 41, relating to acquisition and construction of real property: Appropriates \$187,300,000, of which \$102,300,000 is for four projects authorized by Public Law 910, Eighty-first Congress, as proposed by the Senate instead of \$85,000,000 as proposed by the House; and eliminates the word "classified", as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 42 and 43, relating to research and development: Appropriates \$425,000,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$225,000,000 and \$200,000,000 as proposed by the Senate with same explanation as given under amendments Nos. 9 and 10 above.

Amendment No. 44, relating to Reserve personnel requirements: Includes language "or on duty under section 5, National Defense Act, as authorized by law", as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 45, relating to Reserve personnel requirements: Appropriates \$19,043,000 instead of \$17,543,000 as proposed by the House and \$19,843,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 46, relating to the general provisions of the bill: Provides that enlisted members of the Inactive or Volunteer Reserves who served at least 12 months in World War II and who have served on active duty for a period of 16 months or more after June 26, 1950, shall be discharged unless such member voluntarily consents to remain on active duty.

Amendment 47, relating to general provisions of the bill: Provides that appropriations for "instruction and training, including tuition," shall be "specifically approved by the Secretary of the Department concerned," as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 48, relating to general provisions of the bill: Prohibits use of appropriation to pay tuition or to make other payments to educational institutions in connection with the instruction or training of file clerks, stenographers, and typists receiving, or prospective file clerks, stenographers, and typists who will receive, compensation below the grade GS-5 under the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 49, relating to the general provisions of the bill: Provides for the adjustment of the sales prices at commissary stores necessary to make reimbursements to appropriations to cover overhead or administrative costs, with certain exceptions such as transportation costs outside the United States.

Amendment No. 50, relating to the general provisions of the bill: Provides for 10 temporary positions in grades GS-17 and GS-18, of which not more than 5 shall be in grade GS-18, and not more than 4 positions shall be filled by promotion as proposed by the House instead of 15 temporary positions in the above-mentioned grades of which not more than 8 shall be in grade GS-18 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 51, relating to the general provisions of the bill: Prohibits gratuities to any officer or employee of the Government by contractors or their representatives, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 52, relating to the general provisions of the bill: Limits the number of full-time graded civilian employees to not more than 500,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 53, relating to the general provisions of the bill: Deletes proposed reduction equal to 2½ percent of the amounts appropriated in the bill as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 54, relating to the general provisions of the bill: Corrects the section number to 633 and provides that no part of the

appropriation shall be available for the payment of flight pay to personnel whose actual assigned duties do not involve operational or training flights.

It is the intention of the conferees to make certain that officers and airmen shall not be permitted to draw flight pay except for flights on specific orders for operational or training flights, including such flights as are necessary to maintain the proficiency of administrative personnel.

Amendment No. 55, relating to the general provisions of the bill: Eliminates a proposed Senate amendment proposing a reduction of \$70,000,000 in research and development funds, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 56, relating to the general provisions of the bill: Eliminates a proposed Senate amendment providing that—

No part of any appropriations made by this Act shall be available to reimburse any person for expenses of travel in any amount in excess of the amount of the expenses actually incurred by such person in such travel—

as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 57, relating to the general provisions of the bill: Inserts the figures "634" instead of the figures "630" (section number) as proposed by the House and the figures "637" as proposed by the Senate.

AMENDMENT REPORTED IN DISAGREEMENT

The following amendment is reported in disagreement:

Amendment No. 50, relating to the general provisions of the bill providing for the Office of the Secretary of Defense 10 temporary positions in grades GS-17 and GS-18, of which not to exceed 5 shall be in grade GS-18, and not more than 4 shall be filled by promotion. The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur.

GEORGE MAHON,
HARRY R. SHEPPARD,
ROBERT L. F. SIKES,
JOHN J. RILEY,
CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
ERRETT P. SCRIVNER,
Managers on the Part of the House.



which in fact prevents younger men from being promoted, and helps to freeze the older men in their jobs to the disadvantage of the younger men. In fact it makes less jobs, when one of the purposes of the retirement act was to make more jobs for younger men in the service.

Another provision of the Crosser bill would put all men now employed on railroads with less than 10 years' service under social security, yet so long as they held their railroad jobs would have to pay 6 percent of their salary into the railroad retirement fund, while all social-security workers in other lines of employment would have to pay in only 1½ percent of their salary or wages. This seems unfair to me and I think should have more study before such a drastic step is taken.

Mr. Chairman, the Crosser bill would broaden the social security base by raising the taxable earnings from \$300 a month to \$400 a month which would take \$6 a month more out of the wages of all employees who earn \$400 a month. This would penalize this group and would work a special injustice on the unmarried man who would be making a forced contribution for a surviving wife when he has none.

A number of other objections have been raised to the very confusing and complex provisions of the Crosser bill which time will not permit me to point out.

MUST KEEP RETIREMENT FUND SOUND

Many railroad men for long years have paid a heavy contribution to their railroad retirement fund relying on it to help tide them over their years of retirement. They do not want this fund weakened and endangered. They want it to remain sound. That is the reason the operating brotherhood officials and the members of the committee at this time, and in this legislation, have held the increase of annuities and pensions down to 15 percent increase and the survivor increase down to about 33⅓-percent increase. They believe we should pass this compromise bill now which will give them this much relief, and hold over these new and controversial matters for further and careful study.

GOVERNMENT EXPERTS OPPOSE CROSSER BILL

F. C. Squire of the Railroad Retirement Board testified as follows:

In my opinion, the bill as amended—

The compromise bill before us—is much preferred over the original bill—

Meaning the Crosser bill—

which contemplates savings from a partial coordination with social security and contains other defects. The study of accounting called for to be reported in 1956 in my opinion would be too long deferred. Moreover, it provides for increases in benefits far in excess of the most optimistic estimates of savings to be realized through any or all the methods provided for or contemplated in the bill and would have the effect of making the Railroad Retirement System unsound.

Mr. Squire, one of the ablest members of the Railroad Retirement Board, gave a clear explanation, pointing out the many defects of the Crosser bill and in closing his testimony, said:

In conclusion, I should repeat that in my judgment the enactment of the Crosser bill in its original form would gravely endanger the solvency of the railroad retirement system. This was also the opinion of the insurance actuaries who testified at the hearings. Further, he said, "I think the bill as amended (the present bill) goes as far in the way of liberalization as reasonable prudence and safety will permit."

Mr. Chairman, these are statements from F. C. Squire, one of the ablest members of the Railroad Retirement Board, and the opinion in substance of its actuaries. I am not willing to go against their judgment and take a chance on destroying the trust fund to the great loss of the railway employees who have sacrificed from their wages to build it up.

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

Mr. Chairman, the Federal Security Agency which should know more about this type of legislation than probably any other agency of Government testified before the committee in detail and at great length in opposition to the Crosser bill. I will quote only a few lines of the testimony given by its representative, John L. Thurston, Acting Administrator. In discussing the social-security proposal in the Crosser bill, he said:

The provisions of the Crosser bill which govern the coordination payments by the two programs are inconsistent and difficult to understand and to explain. It is difficult to justify the inconsistency of these provisions on any basis other than a historical one, and almost impossible to secure a clear understanding among the noncareer railroad workers and their families as to what program they should look to for benefits, or what protection they are actually afforded.

Mr. Chairman, again in his testimony, Mr. Thurston said:

We do not believe that the basis provided in the bill for the financial arrangements with the old-age and survivors' insurance program is a sound one.

Further he testified:

It would appear that the coordination provisions of the bill would be cumbersome and expensive from an administration standpoint as a result of the increases in record keeping, transfers of records, and interagency clearances which would be involved.

Mr. Chairman, it appears that the railroad employee when mixed up in this red tape bureaucracy under the Crosser bill could never be sure of his status, and would never know what he had coming, when, or from what agency of Government. It is an unfair position to put the railroad men in when it is so unnecessary.

In closing his testimony on behalf of the Federal Security Agency, Mr. Thurston said:

The Federal Security Agency cannot recommend the enactment of the Crosser bill.

BUREAU OF THE BUDGET

Mr. Chairman, the Bureau of the Budget, when asked for a report on the Crosser bill, pointed out many defects in the bill, and in its analysis at one point said:

An increase of \$1,500,000,000 unfunded liability of the railroad retirement fund would result under the bill largely for credits to

be given to older workers for their service prior to the establishment of the system, which presents a serious financial problem.

And again the Bureau of the Budget reports that—

The estimates of the Railroad Retirement Board show that in the absence of additional financing under the Crosser bill the trust fund would be completely exhausted in 50 years.

Mr. Chairman, now I want to quote briefly from the greatest authority in the United States who was the father of the Railroad Retirement Act, former Chairman of the Railroad Retirement Board, and who has helped to work out pension-retirement funds for the biggest organizations in America during the past 25 years of his constant study of this subject, Mr. Murray W. Latimer, who testified in opposition to the provisions of the original Crosser bill at the hearings recently held by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. The printed hearings contain page upon page of his testimony. However, I will quote in substance, for brevity, just a few of his remarks.

Mr. Latimer at one point in opening his testimony before the committee said in substance, "I think there are ways to deal with this problem. Those ways are not in the bill"—the original Crosser bill—"to which I want particularly to address myself financially and otherwise."

Further discussing the original Crosser bill he said:

There were 3 basic principles included in the Railroad Retirement System. The first was, there was to be no forfeiture to the right of an old age annuity on which a tax had been paid. The Railroad Retirement Act said they would pay him an annuity when he became 65 and left his employment. I had assumed that that was a pledge of the Government of the United States which was to be kept.

Referring to the original Crosser bill, he said:

This bill proposes to repudiate that pledge.

He also said:

Now I have a number of objections to the original Crosser bill.

First. It would result in a tax levy on the vast majority of railroad workers from now on in perpetuity and in return for which it is not proposed to give equivalent value.

Second. It would produce a forfeiture of annuity rights for millions of former railroad workers with no adequate offsetting value and frequently no offsetting value at all.

Third. It would have the effect of reducing some annuities immediately and many others within the next 2 or 3 years. This is far from a bill to increase annuities.

Fourth. It would introduce inequities on a staggering scale and that also in perpetuity.

Mr. Latimer said:

This bill is not going to help labor relations and it is going to make labor relations worse and I think I have a right after 25 years in this field to say so.

Summing up, he said:

I do not think that I have ever seen another legislative proposal by a serious group of people who advocated plain, outright, point-blank repudiation of Government obligations. That is exactly what this bill does.

Mr. Chairman, when one reads the testimony given before the committee and observes that the ablest men in Government and elsewhere who testified are practically unanimous in their opposition to the original Crosser bill and that practically all of them favor the bill before us, I think we must come to the conclusion that the best service we can render at the present time to the millions of fine railroad employees is to pass the committee bill, try to rush it through the Congress and to the President as quickly as possible before this session of Congress recesses.

This bill will increase annuities, pensions, and survivor benefits now, as much as competent experts think the trust fund will stand. They need this relief now. We should pass this legislation today and put the increases into immediate effect.

(Mr. VURSELL and Mr. CROSSER asked and were given permission to revise and extend their remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3669) to amend the Railroad Retirement Act and the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

ARMED SERVICES BILL

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the armed services bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON submitted the following conference report and statement:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1097)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5054) making appropriations for the National Security Council, the National Security Resources Board, and for military functions administered by the Department of Defense, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 5, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 36, 37, 38, 40, 42, 43, 53, 55, and 56.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 34, 35, 44, 47, 51, and 52, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$14,100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amend-

ment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "Provided, That no part of such sum shall be used to pay the retired or retirement pay of any commissioned member of the Regular Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Air Force who is voluntarily retired after the date of enactment of this Act, unless such member was retired because of (1) being unfit to perform the duties of his office, rank, grade, or rating by reason of a physical disability incurred in line of duty, or (2) achieving the age at which retirement is required by law, or (3) whose application is approved in writing by the Secretary of Defense stating that the retirement is in the best interests of the service, or, is required to avoid cases of individual hardship"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"EXPANSION OF UNITED STATES AIR POWER

"For the purpose of providing continuous expansion of United States air power by providing additional construction of aircraft and related procurement, Department of the Navy, \$333,000,000; and by providing additional aircraft and related procurement, Department of the Air Force, \$567,000,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert "Provided further, That until July 1, 1952, further collection by the Comptroller General of the United States or government accountable officers shall not be made on account of payments for accrued leave to enlisted members discharged for the purpose of immediate reenlistment"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "Provided, That none of the funds appropriated in this Act, and none of the property procured therewith, shall be available for transfer to any working capital fund under clothing and equipage in the Department of the Army under section 405 (d) of the National Security Act, as amended"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$193,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert "Provided, That expenditures of appropriations contained in this Act for public informational activities of the Department of Defense shall not exceed \$10,950,000 including pay and allowances of military personnel assigned to such activities: Provided further, That none of the funds appropriated in this Act shall be used for expenditure in connection with recruitment advertising including sponsorship of radio and television shows by the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy or the Department of the Air Force"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amend-

ment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$8,076,056,430"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$1,775,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"For the continuation of the construction of four projects authorized by Public Law 910, Eighty-first Congress, approved January 6, 1951, and Public Law 43, Eighty-second Congress, approved May 31, 1951, to remain available until expended, \$187,300,000 of which \$85,000,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority heretofore granted under this heading to enter into contracts."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 45: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$19,043,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

"(b) No part of any appropriation contained in this Act for 'Pay and allowances' of military personnel shall be expended for the pay or allowances, accruing after November 30, 1951, of any enlisted member of the inactive or volunteer reserve who served on active duty for a period of twelve months or more in any branch of the Armed Forces during the period beginning December 7, 1941, and ending September 2, 1945, if such member shall have served on active duty for a period of sixteen months or more after June 26, 1950, unless such member shall have voluntarily consented to remain on active duty."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 48: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 48, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert "Provided, That no appropriation contained in this Act, and no funds available from prior appropriations to component departments and agencies of the Department of Defense, shall be used to pay tuition or to make other payments to educational institutions in connection with the instruction or training of file clerks, stenographers, and typists receiving, or prospective file clerks, stenographers, and typists who will receive compensation at a rate below the minimum rate of pay for positions allocated to grade GS-5 under the Classification Act of 1949, as amended; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 49: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"Sec. 628. No appropriation contained in this Act shall be available on and after January 1, 1952, in connection with the operation of commissary stores of the agencies of the Department of Defense for the cost

of purchase (including commercial transportation in the United States to the place of sale but excluding all transportation outside the United States) and maintenance of operating equipment and supplies and for the actual or estimated cost of utilities as may be furnished by the Government and of shrinkage, spoilage, and pilferage of merchandise under the control of such commissary stores, except as authorized under regulations promulgated by the Secretaries of the military departments concerned, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense, which regulations shall provide for reimbursement therefor to the appropriations concerned and, notwithstanding any other provision of law, shall provide for the adjustment of the sales prices in such commissary stores to the extent necessary to furnish sufficient gross revenue from sales of commissary stores to make such reimbursement: *Provided, however,* That under such regulations as may be issued pursuant to this section all utilities may be furnished without cost to the commissary stores outside the continental United States and in Alaska."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 54: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"SEC. 633. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be available for the payment of flight pay to personnel whose actual assigned duties do not involve operational or training flights."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 57: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 57, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the figures inserted by said amendment insert "634"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendment numbered 50.

GEORGE MAHON,
HARRY R. SHEPPARD,
ROBERT L. F. SIKES,
JOHN J. RILEY,
CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
ERRETT P. SCRIVNER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
CARL HAYDEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
DENNIS CHAVEZ,
HOMER FERGUSON,
STYLES BRIDGES,
KENNETH S. WHERRY,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5054) making appropriations for the National Security Council, the National Security Resources Board, and for military functions administered by the Department of Defense, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

Amendment No. 1, relating to salaries and expenses, Office of the Secretary of Defense: Appropriates \$14,100,000 instead of \$13,800,000 as proposed by the House and \$14,450,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 2, relating to retired pay: Limits the provisions of the amendment to "commissioned" members of the Regular Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Air Force who are "voluntarily" retired, or to those whose application for retirement is approved in writing by the Secretary of Defense in the best interest of the service, or to avoid cases of individual hardship, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 3, relating to an emergency fund for the construction of aircraft and related procurement: Provides funds in the amount of \$333,000,000 for transfer to the appropriation "Construction of aircraft and related procurement," Department of the Navy, and \$667,000,000 for transfer to the appropriation "Aircraft and related procurement," Department of the Air Force, as proposed by the House.

The purpose of this amendment is to provide an additional fund for the procurement of aircraft and related procurement in order that there will be sufficient funds to place orders for long lead time procurement. This amount should be sufficient to enable the departments concerned to make any necessary procurements for the next few months, when proper presentations can be made to the Congress for further consideration of the entire procurement problem.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Amendment No. 4, relating to pay of the Army: Prohibits until July 1, 1952, the further collection of payments for accrued leave that have been made to enlisted members discharged for the purpose of immediate reenlistment for an indefinite period, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 5, relating to clothing and equipage: Appropriates \$1,506,681,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$1,639,081,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 6, relating to clothing and equipage: Prohibits use of funds in this act for working capital funds under clothing and equipage in the Department of the Army.

The committee desires that a complete report be made under all working capital funds in the different services to the Committees on Appropriation of the House of Representatives and the Senate semiannually, and so directs.

Amendment No. 7, relating to incidental expenses of the Army: Appropriates \$193,000,000 instead of \$187,914,000 as proposed by the House and \$194,514,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 8, relating to incidental expenses of the Army: Prohibits the use of funds appropriated in this act for expenditures for recruitment advertising, including radio and television shows. Examination of this matter will be the subject of further consideration.

Amendments Nos. 9 and 10, relating to Transportation Service, Army: Appropriates \$968,515,000 as proposed by the House instead of "\$938,515,000 for expenditure during fiscal year 1952 and thereafter during 1953 and \$30,000,000 for expenditure during fiscal year 1953 for the purposes authorized in this paragraph," as proposed by the Senate.

The bill as passed by the House included funds in several instances for procurements in excess of the procurements that might be made during fiscal year 1952. This was done for the purpose of providing authority to the departments to enter into long lead time procurements, a portion of which would not be delivered and require payment therefor until after the end of fiscal year 1952. The Senate proposed to separate the amounts required for expenditure during fiscal year 1952 from those that would be required thereafter in order to make clear that the total sum appropriated would not flow into the stream of purchasing power

during fiscal year 1952. That purpose, we think, has been clearly established in the publicity that has been given the matter. The Senate concurs in the proposal to return to the House position.

Amendments Nos. 11 and 12, relating to the Signal Service of the Army: Appropriates \$1,213,707,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$817,931,000 and \$400,000,000 as proposed by the Senate with same explanation as given under amendments Nos. 9 and 10 above.

Amendments Nos. 13 and 14, relating to Medical and Hospital Department: Appropriates \$269,580,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$259,580,000 and \$10,000,000 as proposed by the Senate with same explanation as given under amendments Nos. 9 and 10 above.

Amendments Nos. 15 and 16, relating to Engineer Service, Army: Appropriates \$1,166,049,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$1,126,049,000 and \$40,000,000 as proposed by the Senate with same explanation as given under amendments Nos. 9 and 10 above.

Amendments Nos. 17 and 18, relating to Ordnance Service and Supplies, Army: Appropriates \$8,307,500,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$3,332,082,430 and \$4,743,974,000 as proposed by the Senate with explanation as given under amendments Nos. 9 and 10 above.

Amendments Nos. 19 and 20, relating to Chemical Service, Army: Appropriates \$122,560,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$102,560,000 and \$20,000,000 as proposed by the Senate with same explanation as given under amendments Nos. 9 and 10 above.

Amendment No. 21, relating to salaries, Office of the Secretary of the Army: Appropriates \$3,723,400 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$3,625,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 22, relating to salaries, Office of the Judge Advocate General: Appropriates \$743,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$700,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 23, relating to salaries, Office of the Quartermaster General: Appropriates \$9,875,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$9,625,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 24, relating to salaries, Office of the Chief of Transportation: Appropriates \$4,024,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$3,800,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 25, relating to salaries, Office of Chief of Ordnance: Appropriates \$6,750,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$6,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 26, relating to salaries, Department of the Army: Limits the expenditures for salaries, Department of the Army, to 95 percent of the amount appropriated in the specific items for salaries.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Amendments Nos. 27, 28, and 29, relating to construction of aircraft and related procurement: Appropriates \$4,000,000,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$1,050,000,000 and \$2,950,000,000 as proposed by the Senate with same explanation as given under amendments Nos. 9 and 10 above.

Amendments Nos. 30 and 31, relating to shipbuilding and conversion: Appropriates \$1,343,297,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$245,040,000 and \$1,098,257,000 as proposed by the Senate with same explanation as given under amendments Nos. 9 and 10 above.

Amendments Nos. 32 and 33, relating to ordnance for shipbuilding and conversion: Appropriates \$431,390,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$75,000,000 and \$356,390,000 as proposed by the Senate with same explanation as given under amendments Nos. 9 and 10 above.

Amendment No. 34, relating to public works: Appropriates \$51,657,000 as proposed

by the Senate instead of \$50,414,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 35, relating to public works: Provides that \$1,243,000 of the appropriation mentioned above in amendment No. 34 be used for construction at Newport, R. I., as proposed by the Senate.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

Amendments Nos. 36, 37, and 38, relating to aircraft and related procurement: Appropriates \$11,215,800,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$3,215,800,000 and \$8,000,000,000 as proposed by the Senate with explanation the same as given under amendments Nos. 9 and 10 above.

Amendments Nos. 39 and 40, relative to major procurement other than aircraft: Appropriates \$1,775,000,000 instead of \$1,750,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,000,000,000 and \$800,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, with explanation as given under amendments Nos. 9 and 10, above.

Amendment No. 41, relating to acquisition and construction of real property: Appropriates \$187,300,000, of which \$102,300,000 is for four projects authorized by Public Law 910, Eighty-first Congress, as proposed by the Senate instead of \$85,000,000 as proposed by the House; and eliminates the word "classified"; as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 42 and 43, relating to research and development: Appropriates \$425,000,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$225,000,000 and \$200,000,000 as proposed by the Senate with same explanation as given under amendments Nos. 9 and 10 above.

Amendment No. 44, relating to Reserve personnel requirements: Includes language "or on duty under section 5, National Defense Act, as authorized by law", as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 45, relating to Reserve personnel requirements: Appropriates \$19,043,000 instead of \$17,543,000 as proposed by the House and \$19,843,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 46, relating to the general provisions of the bill: Provides that enlisted members of the Inactive or Volunteer Reserves who served at least 12 months in World War II and who have served on active duty for a period of 16 months or more after June 26, 1950, shall be discharged unless such member voluntarily consents to remain on active duty.

Amendment No. 47, relating to general provisions of the bill: Provides that appropriations for "instruction and training, including tuition," shall be "specifically approved by the Secretary of the Department concerned," as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 48, relating to general provisions of the bill: Prohibits use of appropriation to pay tuition or to make other payments to educational institutions in connection with the instruction or training of file clerks, stenographers, and typists receiving, or prospective file clerks, stenographers, and typists who will receive, compensation below the grade GS-5 under the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 49, relating to the general provisions of the bill: Provides for the adjustment of the sales prices at commissary stores necessary to make reimbursements to appropriations to cover overhead or administrative costs, with certain exceptions such as transportation costs outside the United States.

Amendment No. 50, relating to the general provisions of the bill: Provides for 10 temporary positions in grades GS-17 and GS-18, of which not more than 5 shall be in grade GS-18, and not more than 4 positions shall be filled by promotion as proposed by the House instead of 15 temporary positions in the above-mentioned grades of which not more than 8 shall be in grade GS-18 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 51, relating to the general provisions of the bill: Prohibits gratuities to any officer or employee of the Government by contractors or their representatives, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 52, relating to the general provisions of the bill: Limits the number of full-time graded civilian employees to not more than 500,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 53, relating to the general provisions of the bill: Deletes proposed reduction equal to 2½ percent of the amounts appropriated in the bill as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 54, relating to the general provisions of the bill: Corrects the section number to 633 and provides that no part of the appropriation shall be available for the payment of flight pay to personnel whose actual assigned duties do not involve operational or training flights.

It is the intention of the conferees to make certain that officers and airmen shall not be permitted to draw flight pay except for flights on specific orders for operational or training flights, including such flights as are necessary to maintain the proficiency of administrative personnel.

Amendment No. 55, relating to the general provisions of the bill: Eliminates a proposed Senate amendment proposing a reduction of \$70,000,000 in research and development funds, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 56, relating to the general provisions of the bill: Eliminates a proposed Senate amendment providing that "No part of any appropriations made by this Act shall be available to reimburse any person for expenses of travel in any amount in excess of the amount of the expenses actually incurred by such person in such travel," as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 57, relating to the general provisions of the bill: Inserts the figures "634" instead of the figures "630" (section number) as proposed by the House and the figures "637" as proposed by the Senate.

AMENDMENT REPORTED IN DISAGREEMENT

The following amendment is reported in disagreement:

Amendment No. 50, relating to the general provisions of the bill providing for the Office of the Secretary of Defense, 10 temporary positions in grades GS-17 and GS-18, of which not to exceed 5 shall be in grade GS-18, and not more than 4 shall be filled by promotion. The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur.

GEORGE MAHON,
HARRY R. SHEPPARD,
ROBERT L. F. SIKES,
JOHN J. RILEY,
CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
ERRETT P. SCRIVNER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

A LONG-RANGE FARM PROGRAM

(Mr. LOVRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation which I consider vital to a strong, healthy, expanding national economy. Without fear of contradiction, I categorically state that we cannot have a strong, healthy, expanding national economy without a healthy and prosperous agriculture. We well remember what happened to agriculture in the thirties and the near fatal results on our national economy. This must not be permitted to happen again.

The price support program instituted by Congress has helped to assure the farmer a fairer price for his products. But, it is inadequate. The farmer must

have full 100 percent parity price for his produce.

Mr. Speaker, the present support program operates through loans and direct Government purchases. Under the loan program, farmers receive a loan on their crop. Then they can do one of two things.

First. Sell the crop at going market prices, which may be higher than the support price, and pay off the loan with the proceeds.

Second. Let the loan lapse—if market prices are down—and turn the crop over to the Government.

Under the direct purchase program, the Government supports prices by buying crops when necessary.

It is true that this program has resulted in losses. I am informed that support losses for the fiscal year ending June 30 were approximately \$345,000,000. The Government lost \$249,000,000 in fiscal 1950; \$254,000,000 in 1949; \$125,000,000 in 1948; \$71,000,000 in 1947; and a yearly average of \$125,000,000 from 1941 to 1946. Because of these losses, the farmer and the support program have been severely criticized and maligned.

This criticism is not justified. The support program was never intended to be self-liquidating. Its purpose was to provide the farmer a fairer price for his products in relation to the cost of the items he must buy. As a result of this program the purchasing power of the farmer has been expanded and the entire economy has benefited. It must be pointed out, however, that this program is not and has not been considered as a long range program. It is stopgap legislation at its best.

Mr. Speaker, I was born and reared in a farm community and have lived in a rural community all my life. I know farmers and I know that not a single one of them wants something for nothing. They are self-reliant and all they ask is a fair chance. They do not want subsidies at the taxpayer's expense. All they ask is a fair price at the marketplace for their produce. They want a farm program that will be operated and controlled by the farmers themselves and not from Washington.

Mr. Speaker, this bill was first introduced on May 15, 1950, during the Eighty-first Congress. Into this bill has gone the sound, solid advice of thousands of South Dakota and upper Midwest farmers. Before the bill was introduced in 1950, I invited 85,000 farmers to some 32 grass-roots meetings in my district. From these meetings, which were nothing more than frank, down-to-earth forums on the needs and desires of agriculture, came many of the provisions of this farm bill. Since this series of meetings, I have had the opportunity to travel throughout my district. Again I talked over this plan, its provisions and its potentialities with grass-roots farmers.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to say that the people of my district are behind this plan.

We know that the dramatic, threatening world situation which has grown increasingly worse during the past year has demanded more and more from



Congressional Record

United States
of America

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 82^d CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 97

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, OCTOBER 5, 1951

No. 187

Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Monday, October 8, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

House of Representatives

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 5, 1951

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou eternal God, our Father, whose heart always opens with love in response to those who truly seek Thee, inspire us now with a greater faith in prayer and may we never set any limits to its efficacy and its possibilities.

Grant that daily we may yield ourselves in a glad and willing obedience to the mind of our blessed Lord for we are desperately in need of His spirit to give us hope and courage and to restrain us from harboring those feelings of cynicism and doubt which so often storm the citadel of our souls.

May we be eager to have a larger part in hastening the drawing of that better day when out of this world's tragedies and tyrannies, its hatred and bitterness, its bigotry and prejudice, its selfishness and sin, there shall emerge a social order that has in it the Master's spirit of good-will and kindness and love.

Hear us in His name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Landers, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2170. An act to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 5054) making appropriations for the National Security Council, the National Security Resources Board, and for military functions administered by the Depart-

ment of Defense, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of October 4, 1951.)

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, peace must be actively and affirmatively sought after just like victory in war requires aggressive and affirmative effort. The military-appropriation measure which is before us today in the form of the conference report is not a war measure; it is a peace measure. This is a part of the peace offensive of the United States.

We are not attempting to rattle the saber, to threaten and intimidate, or to instill fear in the hearts of peace-loving people. On the contrary, by affirmative action, we seek to give hope to free people, to give some greater degree of security to our own Nation and to give discouragement to totalitarianism and aggression. The conference report, the final version of the bill as agreed upon by the conferees, is substantially what the bill contained when it passed the House.

The conference report provides \$56,900,000,000 for the Army, Navy, and Air Force for the current fiscal year. Of this amount \$19,883,032,030 is for the Army, \$15,877,891,000 for the Navy and Marine Corps, and \$20,642,785,000 for the Air Force. The sum of \$529,100,000 is provided for the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

It will be understood that when the current fiscal year began the Department

of Defense had on hand about \$37,000,000,000 from fiscal years 1950 and 1951 which had not been expended. Most of this money had been obligated, and much of it was not made available until late in the fiscal year 1951. The money made it possible for the Department of Defense to make firm contracts with industry for the procurement of tanks, ships, aircraft, and other weapons of war. Actually, much of the money will not be spent for a couple of years because of the long lead time required by industry for the actual delivery of certain items of procurement.

When we add the \$56,900,000,000 which will be made available in the current measure to the \$37,000,000,000 carry-over from previous fiscal years we will have a total available for expenditure by the Department of Defense during the current fiscal year of approximately \$94,000,000,000. The Army, Navy, and Air Force expect to actually expend during the current fiscal year \$40,000,000,000. Hence, the projected carry-over of funds into the next fiscal year will be about \$54,000,000,000. This money is required, however, in order that the Defense Establishment can make firm contracts with industry for long-lead-time items such as airplanes, electronics equipment, ships, tanks, guided missiles, research and development programs, and expenditures of this general type. Of course, contract authorizations rather than actual appropriations could have been resorted to, but the contract-authorization procedure is confusing and more difficult of administration, and the contract-authorization procedure does not save any money directly or indirectly. It rather increases the costs of the defense program.

I think most of you know, the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force spent during the last fiscal year about \$20,000,000,000,

or something over \$19,000,000,000. During the current fiscal year, it is expected that while we are appropriating here \$56,000,000,000, only \$40,000,000,000 will be expended, and the other money will be obligated for the long lead time items.

The most important change which was made in the bill by the other body was the placing in the bill of a \$5,000,000,000 national emergency fund, which was labeled for air power. There were hardly any strings attached to the \$5,000,000,000. It was a sort of blank-check affair. In conference, and I think I violate no confidence, the Senate did not feel that the \$5,000,000,000 was justified under the circumstances. No budget estimate had been submitted, and no sufficiently definite declaration was made to us as to precisely how the money would be spent. However, certain estimates were submitted but no complete and authoritative picture of the situation was presented. The Department of Defense was not ready for final action. We all agreed, and I think we are now agreed, and I think the House agrees, that additional funds are going to be necessary this year for air power in the United States Air Force, and in the Navy. But, since the program has not been fully set and crystallized, it was thought that \$5,000,000,000 should not be provided at this time. However, the conference report does include the sum of \$1,000,000,000 in addition, and above the budget requests, for the acceleration of our air power, so that we can move more rapidly from the 95-group program to a higher figure. This money will be available for obligation for long lead time items such as aircraft and more particularly, electronic devices and so forth which are so critical and so difficult of procurement.

The \$1,000,000,000 will provide for an immediate acceleration of Air Force objectives beyond 95 wings. Of course, this will only be a first step. January is not far away and when Congress reconvenes in January, Congress can provide new additional funds which will be necessary. By that time, Department of Defense officials will have finalized their program and will be in a position to outline in detail the new program to Congress. I personally have no doubt about the urgent necessity for a further implementation of our Air Force program. Many of us have advocated such an accelerated program for some time.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Allen, La.	[Roll No. 190]	
Anfuso	Bramblett	Crawford
Auchincloss	Brooks	Dawson
Baker	Brown, Ohio	Deane
Bates, Ky.	Busbey	Delaney
Boggs, La.	Celler	Dempsey
Bolton	Chelf	Denton
	Cole, N. Y.	Dollinger

Durham	McMullen	Sadlak
Fernandez	Marshall	Scudder
Gamble	Miller, Calif.	Shafer
Gregory	Morrison	Sheehan
Hébert	Murphy	Short
Heffernan	Murray, Wis.	Sittler
Hess	O'Konski	Smith, Va.
Hollifield	Perkins	Spence
Howell	Phillips	Staggers
Jackson, Calif.	Powell	Stanley
Kearney	Price	Thompson, Tex.
Kennedy	Prouty	Velde
Keogh	Quinn	Vinson
Kilburn	Radwan	Watts
King	Ramsay	Whitaker
Latham	Redden	Willis
Lucas	Rivers	Wilson, Ind.
McCulloch	Roosevelt	
McMillan	Sabath	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 351 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] has the floor.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, when the quorum call began I was discussing the accelerated program for air power and explaining that in the \$56,000,000,000 military appropriation bill we had included \$1,000,000,000 above and beyond the budget request which would be available to the United States Air Force and to the Bureau of Aeronautics of the Navy—one-third to the Navy and two-thirds to the Air Force—for the procurement of long lead time items, procurement which would be very helpful in expediting the movement from 95 wings to a higher level. That was the \$1,000,000,000.

Each year, about October or November, the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Department of Defense determine what their recommendations will be for the program for the succeeding fiscal year.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff have unanimously agreed on the accelerated air-power program, but I am not at liberty to give the details of the agreement. The proposed accelerated program has not yet been approved by the Secretary of Defense, the President, and the National Security Council. After all, before final approval can be given the accelerated program, it is necessary to consider whether or not industry and labor can provide the materials and the construction essential to the program of expansion. Of course, there are also very grave fiscal considerations which must be weighed carefully by the executive branch of the Government and the Congress before a final decision can be reached on the exact magnitude of the new air-power program.

As I have said, I personally feel, and have felt for a long time, that we must increase the Air Force beyond the 95-wing program, and I am pleased to say that indications are that the Air Force will be increased in a series of steps from the present 95-wing structure to about 140 wings.

In my judgment, a supplemental appropriation bill will be required for the current fiscal year within the range of five to ten billion dollars for augmentation of our air power and for costs inci-

dent to the Korean war. These supplemental requests could be submitted to Congress in January.

Much has been said in recent weeks about certain new weapons. This is no time for a discussion of the subject, but I think one sentence would be appropriate at the moment: Those fantastic statements about fantastics weapons are entirely too fantastic. No right thinking person is going to be misled by all this superman talk or push-button warfare. There is no easy and inexpensive road to victory in war. Happily our objective is not war but peace.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, the amount of revenue that will be required to balance the fiscal year 1952 budget will to a large extent hinge upon the rate of expenditure, I think, as the gentleman will agree, on this military appropriation bill. I think you mentioned in the course of your remarks the projected amount of spending during the fiscal year 1952 of this total appropriation. I wonder if the gentleman would elaborate and reassert the estimates that he gave us.

Mr. MAHON. During the last fiscal year, the military, that is, the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force expended about \$20,000,000,000. During the current fiscal year, they will expend about \$40,000,000,000, according to the best estimates of the Department of Defense and the Bureau of the Budget. They will have available, however, that is the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, the total sum of something like \$95,000,000,000 for expenditures, but only about \$40,000,000,000 of the whole sum can be expended. The other money is required for long lead time items, which will not be delivered and, therefore, will not be paid for during the current fiscal year.

Mr. HARVEY. In other words, in addition to this appropriation here, there are are additional funds which are not presently obligated, or if obligated, items are not sufficiently near completion to be spent, so that out of the total appropriations, the unspent funds plus this amount that you estimate, only about \$40,000,000,000 will be spent during the current fiscal year of 1952?

Mr. MAHON. That is right. The carry over from the last fiscal year is about \$37,000,000,000.

Mr. REGAN. Mr. Speaker, we are now into the sixteenth month of the so-called police action or undeclared war in Korea. As our casualty lists mount and an apparent stalemate continues while our enemies regroup and build up their reserves of men and material, our people are becoming increasingly restive and impatient, as well they might.

Many of our newspapers are reflecting that growing concern in their editorials, and the El Paso Times, largest and most influential newspaper in my district, the Sixteenth in Texas, has been carrying a most pointed series of editorials reflecting the views of so many of our people which I felt more than

worthy of the attention of all the Members of Congress, and I quote one of the most recent editorials by the able editor of this newspaper, Mr. W. J. Hooten, whom many of you know:

WHY KOREA?

How many Americans are paying close attention to press dispatches telling of the bloody fighting going on in Korea?

It is possible that too many of us take one look at headlines about Korea and turn to something else.

"That is old stuff," we may feel inclined to say to ourselves.

Is it?

The Times recommends that every one of its readers again peruse the dispatches telling of the heartbreaking battle on Heartbreak Ridge which was described in Monday's Times.

Only three exhausted American infantrymen, remnants of a platoon, made it to the crest in the final drive at sunset. They were followed by reinforcements. Then, within 24 hours, North Koreans drove them off again.

Those are American boys, our boys, who are fighting and dying in far-off Korea. They are being called upon to give their lives in a so-called police action, which has developed into an undeclared war.

Those boys were sent into action by the President of the United States without Congress having a word to say about it.

The feeling today, both in Congress and among the people, is that "We are stuck with it; what can we do about it?"

Last April it was hoped that the fighting would be localized in Korea, that it would peter out around the thirty-eighth parallel. Then came the truce talks. Today, fighting as heavy as any that has taken place in Korea in several months again is raging with American boys being killed or maimed.

Let's insist that Congress either declare war and that we go all out in support of our young men in Korea or that we demand, and get, an explanation of what it is all about.

If we do not get either, it will be time to insist that we do an about-face and get out of Korea altogether.

That may seem to be drastic. What of it?

It may be said that we need no explanation of what is going on in Korea; that it is obvious: we are trying to stop aggression.

We were not attacked.

The Times reiterates the American people are entitled to an explanation of what it is all about. If we have reason, we ought to declare war formally and then win it as quickly as possible.

I would also like to add a short story appearing on the front page of a Washington paper, Tuesday, October 2:

U. N. CAN END WAR WITH SUCCESS, BRADLEY SAYS

WITH UNITED STATES THIRD DIVISION IN KOREA (Tuesday), October 2.—Gen. Omar N. Bradley said today the United Nations could bring the Korean war to a successful "military conclusion" if the suspended truce talks break off completely.

He did not elaborate on what was implied in the phrase "military conclusion."

Is there a Member of Congress who would not like to see that "military conclusion" accomplished at once? I think not.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, this bill comes back to the House with an increase of approximately \$900,000,000 above the bill as it passed the House. It calls for a total of \$56,939,568,030. We have reached a compromise upon a great many of the

items. There was an item of \$5,000,000,000 put in by the Senate for expansion of air power, but when we came to get down to it and try to find out what it was all about the President refused to send any budget estimate, and the justifications submitted did not support the request. We have, however, agreed with the other body upon the amount that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], referred to \$1,000,000,000, two-thirds to go to the Air Force for airplane construction and one-third to the Navy for airplane construction.

We believe that there is a serious question as to whether they can effectively and efficiently obligate that amount during the time between now and the 30th of next June.

The other items of a major character that were in disagreement were those relating to retirement which we have worked out on a basis very largely along the line of the House language which was submitted by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the gentleman to yield. I wonder if this is an opportune time to do so.

Mr. TABER. The gentleman may do that now.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I trust that some of the members of the Ways and Means Committee are present in the Chamber. Here we are dealing with an appropriation of billions and billions of dollars for national defense. We are making this appropriation because we are requested to do it for the security of the country. We all recognize that these great appropriations that we are making are straining our economy to the utmost. That means that we should be looking every place we can on the home front for opportunities to save money. One place where we can save money was clearly and forcefully pointed out to us by the unanimous action of the governors of the 48 States this week in Tennessee. In their conference the governors unanimously asked the Congress to return to the States, as was originally intended, under the act, the right to handle welfare operations. The governors have in substance asked the Congress to do away with the compulsory secrecy clause enacted in 1938. They have in effect said to this Congress: "You do this and we will save money not only for ourselves but we will also save money for you." My State in its wisdom undertook to act, but notwithstanding the obligations the law provides in that direction, Federal Security Administrator Oscar Ewing erroneously has taken from Indiana the money it is entitled to receive. It is obvious that action should be taken by the Congress. This is a matter which should not be delayed for weeks or for months. The time is now for this House of Representatives, through its conferees on the various bills now in conference, to accept the Senate amendment which would return to the States the right to handle this matter in a manner that the States—and the citizens of those States—believe it can best be handled.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the action of the gentleman from New York [Mr.

TABER] in yielding to me because here is one place where we unquestionably can save money, and we can do it also as we go along with the other appropriation bills upon which we are required to act. Why should we, perhaps because of some hoped-for political advantage, stand in the way of action taken in the other body? Three times that body has voted for this provision to let the States handle this matter. This amendment should be kept in conference by agreement of our conferees and it should be approved by the membership of the House of Representatives.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the Senate has agreed to the major part of the House language in connection with another amendment, No. 46, offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] who is entitled to a great deal of credit for having offered this amendment. It has been changed so that now the amendment is limited to the enlisted personnel and it has also been changed so that the period of service shall be 16 months instead of 12. This is necessary because at the time the amendment was adopted, practically 2 months ago, conditions were different and it is now necessary to do something of this kind. As I stated, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] is entitled to a great deal of credit for that.

The amendment on the flight pay proposition, which was agreed to, limits the flight pay to personnel whose actually assigned duties involve operational or training flights. This allows the Air Force and the Navy to operate and give this flight pay to those who are legitimately entitled to it and will prevent a great many abuses which have occurred up to the present time.

Mr. Speaker, under all the circumstances I think we should support the conference report as it has been presented.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, at this late day in a long and hard session, a little levity might not be out of order. I serve on a subcommittee which is presided over by a Texan, a great Texan among the many great Texans whom it is our privilege to know. And appreciating them for their work as we do, I call attention to an item which appeared in the morning paper.

Incidentally, I had always thought when Texans die they hope to spend paradise in Florida but this article states:

A Texan passed away, and upon arriving at the gates of his eternal home remarked: "Gee, I never thought that heaven was so much like Texas." The man at the gate said sadly: "Son, this ain't heaven."

Now back to the conference report. I think I may as well repeat what has been said many times on this floor. If war should come in the near future we are not appropriating enough money for the security we need. If war does not

come we are appropriating too much money. Only the Kremlin knows. None of us can know that we are right in the action we now recommend, but we do know from long and bitter experience that a strong defense is the only real security this Nation now has and the only security the free world now has.

In this report we are proud of the fact that we have been able to save below the figure in the Senate bill about enough money to pay for the military construction bill which we still must bring to the floor. We have secured a reduction of about four billions. We think that is something of an accomplishment. We have corrected a number of weaknesses in military practices that have been costly and we think that too represents something of an accomplishment. We have insured a little more humane consideration for the enlisted reservists, many of whom already had given long years of service in World War II.

Frankly, we would like to save a lot more money than we have been able to save in the Military Establishment. The House has shown time and again its interest in savings. It has made a commendable record in budget reductions this year on virtually all appropriation bills. Military funds are harder to cut. No one wants to take a chance on jeopardizing national defense. Yet our subcommittee has made cuts. It has dug out and eliminated every unjustified dollar it possibly could in the time allotted to it, and with the staff available to it we have made every reasonable effort we could to save while at the same time we strengthened the military machine. If there are other places where savings can properly and safely be made, I will welcome that information from anyone at any time and I will cooperate to see that those savings are made. I do feel that this unanimous report represents the best effort we can achieve at this time.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARVEY. In furtherance of the colloquy that I had with the gentleman from Texas, as I understood about \$37,000,000,000 of prior appropriations remain to be spent.

Mr. SIKES. It is obligated but has not been spent because delivery has not been made on some of the articles ordered. Many of the articles that we are buying now are so complicated that it takes months and even years to build them or in some cases tool up and expand production in order to build them.

Mr. HARVEY. I understand. Further, that the estimate is that about \$40,000,000,000 will be spent during 1952.

Mr. SIKES. That is the estimate that we have.

Mr. HARVEY. So actually the total cash expenditure contemplated out of this appropriation during current fiscal 1952 will, as now estimated, be approximately \$3,000,000,000; is that about correct?

Mr. SIKES. No; I cannot say that I follow that. You are confusing 2 years appropriations for all purposes. Re-

member that we have pay and allowances, food, gas, oil, ammunition, and all the other things that go into the current operations of the service. We are appropriating \$57,000,000,000 in fiscal 1952. Of that amount \$37,000,000,000 is for hardware. The remainder is primarily for housekeeping, pay, and operations. What the gentleman is thinking of is money in procurement itself. I believe a total of about \$40,000,000,000 is to be spent in fiscal 1952. The remainder will be obligated but not actually spent.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. For example, we are appropriating money to pay and feed and clothe the Military Establishment of 3,500,000 men and that will cost well over \$10,000,000,000 itself. This money that is carried over will be used on this long-time procurement and of the money appropriated a very considerable sum will be used this year.

Mr. SIKES. About \$8,000,000,000 will go for pay itself. This is a part of the \$20,000,000,000 housekeeping and operations fund which I described.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER].

(Mr. SCRIVNER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I think in all fairness, with maybe a little bit of pride, we can justifiably say that this group of seven men on the military subcommittee on appropriations are entitled to a great deal of credit for the work they have done. We have been in session in a little cubby hole down here under the House almost continuously since the 15th of December, day in and day out, starting early in the morning and working as late as we could get reporters in the evening. That was true of holidays; that was true of Saturdays. After all those months of work we reported a bill here which the House adopted unanimously. Then the bill went over to the other body, and for some reason or other they had heard some tall tales about some fantastic weapon, and then they came out with what might be termed a fantastic addition to the appropriations that we already made available, namely, \$5,000,000,000, for which there was no justification. We asked the Air Force what they told the other body what they had not told us, and they said absolutely nothing, so if they had not told them any different from what we had heard, we did not feel that the \$5,000,000,000 was necessary or could be properly and wisely used. Personally, I would have favored not giving them any additional money over that given by the House at all, but as you gentlemen know, conferences are matters of compromise. You have to work out your differences some way, somehow, the best way you can, in order that a bill can be passed so that these funds will be available. It has been too long delayed now for many reasons, for which the House cannot be chargeable. So the result was that individual views

had to give way to the views of the majority, and an additional billion dollars was granted to the Army, to the Air Force and the Navy for the procurement of airplanes. It takes from 16 to 18, 20, and 22 months to obtain a new modern plane with all its electronics and radar on it, so that it will probably be 2 years before any of this billion dollars actually brings results in the way of a finished product. Now what will happen in that 2 years, nobody knows. If somebody could tell me that there would not be any major world war within the next 2 years or 3 years, we could have very safely cut many of these items. We are gambling; we are taking out some insurance for the security of the United States. If war does not come, much of this money appropriated will not be used; it will be for items used in peacetime training or used in Korea or any place where our troops are now serving.

So, I think on the whole the House can feel assured the conferees have done a good job. There was one item where I again had to let my own personal views give way to the views of the majority of the conferees, namely, the release of veteran reservists at the end of a year's service. I feel that a year was proper. These men have served all the way from a year to, some of them, five and a half or 6 years during World War II. Their lives have been disrupted. Everything has been changed. They have been called back to serve again, while literally hundreds of thousands, yes, millions of Americans have not served a single solitary day. So I felt as others have felt, that once they have served overseas, served during World War II, and then were called in again, 1 year's service was enough, especially for enlisted men, who do not get very many good breaks in any man's army.

There again, personal views, personal desires, had to give way to the wishes of the majority in order to bring to this body a conference report.

As I said a moment ago, this is a hard-working committee. I think it is an exceptionally fine committee.

All the way through, I believe we have done a good job. I think we could have done without this extra billion but again, who knows, the majority said we should have it, and we hope it will be spent wisely. I hope this conference report will receive unanimous support from the House.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

(Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, amendment No. 46, which is contained in the conference report, represents a compromise on the part of the conferees of both Houses. I appreciate the difficulties that confronted the conferees but I am not satisfied with the 16-month provision. It represents nothing more than window dressing.

To refresh the memories of the Members of the House, my original amendment provided that where a veteran of World War II was a member of the

Volunteer or Inactive Reserves and was called up against his own wishes, if he had more than 12 months' service in World War II and had served 12 months in the Korean War, then beginning November 30, 1951, he would be separated from service because no money would be available to pay his monthly wages.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Here is the thing that was pointed out, and it had quite a bit of merit to it; namely, that many of these men about whom the gentleman and I are concerned have already been in 12 months or more. Some of them went in late in July, some early in August, and some in September. The language of the bill as written is that if they have served over 12 months that would prohibit the use of any of this money for paying them. If this is adopted right away, it will take 2 weeks or 3 weeks or a month to process many of these men for immediate discharge. Therefore, taking all of those things into consideration, the gentleman and I would not want them to be deprived of their pay just because they have been in 12 months; would we?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. They would not be deprived of their pay because under my amendment they are not eligible for separation until after November 30, which is approximately 8 weeks from this date.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Yes, they would, because none of this money could be used for the payment for their services after the expiration of 12 months. Seeing that picture, and while things went on in conference that may not be made public, I am not going to make any bones about the fact that I did not like the 12-month provision. I went up to a figure a trifle higher. This was the best we could do. It will take a few days to get this through. Let us say it becomes effective the 1st of November. Then, by the 30th of November, by the time most of them will be processed out, it will be close to 15 months.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I repeat that under my amendment an inactive or volunteer reservist to be eligible for discharge after November 30 he must have 12 months' service in World War II and 12 months in the Korean war.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I thought all the way through that really was the best we could do.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I appreciate what the gentleman says he tried to do in conference, but, frankly, here is the situation. Under existing law, the volunteer and inactive reservists can be discharged after 17 months of service unless the need for his rank or rate is considered critical by the Secretary. The compromise offered us eliminates the officers entirely and provides that the 17 months under existing law is reduced 30 days and made applicable only to enlisted personnel. In short, the so-called compromise is a delusion and a snare.

Mr. SCRIVNER. That is what is happening in so many cases. When they

try to get their release, their category is always needed.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That is right.

Mr. SCRIVNER. This provision is necessary if the majority of these veterans of World War II are going to be out any time soon.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That is right.

I want to remind you that your mail as well as mine has been full of criticism from members of the armed services who are volunteer and inactive reservists. You know the story of their treatment. I want to remind you that Mrs. Rosenberg admitted before the House Committee on Armed Services that inactive and volunteer reservists have been shamefully treated. Therefore, as a Member of this Congress, I shall not support any so-called compromise because to do so it is simply condoning the shabby treatment accorded Reserve personnel. It is interesting to note that the armed services cried that my amendment would destroy the services and hamper their combat efficiency. As a result of this outburst from the Pentagon I did a little research myself. What did I find? I found that in the Senate, Senator LYNDON JOHNSON's manpower committee had studied the manpower utilization as far as the military is concerned. What do you suppose that committee said about the surplus of military manpower? Let me read from the report of this Senate committee:

The officers and enlisted men assigned to "permanent post" status at the 16 installations and performing some type of overhead function total 95,784. This is well over five divisions of men, most of whom are presumably physically and mentally fit for full military duty.

There alone you have enough surplus personnel to replace many of the inactive and volunteer reservists that would be affected by my amendment.

Let us see what a newspaperman has to say about the treatment accorded Reserves. The *Globe Boston Traveler* of Wednesday, August 8, 1951, in an article by Hal Clancy, said:

One reason frankly admitted was because the United States was caught short, and the mobilizers just grabbed the cards of men who were not assigned to organized units.

Then he went on to say, and he is quoting an Army officer:

"Give them the business—give them the business." That is an accurate quote.

Hal Clancy said:

Those words were said to me by one Army official in an off-the-record discussion.

That is the attitude of some of the Regular Establishment toward our inactive volunteer Reserve.

Then, let me read to you from a letter received by an officer from Korea. Here is what he has to say:

There are 7 major airfields in Japan which have a complement averaging 3,500 men each. These airfields merely contain an average of 150 personnel engaged in actual flying. Nonflying personnel on the basis of World War II standards for these type airfields should never exceed 2,000 men.

The staff officers to command such airfields during World War II usually consisted of a colonel and about 20 field grade officers. Currently, the same organization has a brig-

adier general, 4 colonels, and about 30 field grade officers.

These airfields contained an average of about 30 fighter-bomber-type aircraft. During World War II airfields of this type were handling three times this quantity of aircraft with smaller personnel. This obviously means that in Japan the Air Force has twice the amount of airfields they actually need.

In addition to these facts, the internal administration of Air Force bases are broken down into matériel, personnel, inspection comptroller, special service, legal, intelligence, communications, and public information. I have personally seen the operations of these administrative functions and I would conservatively estimate that each section was overstaffed five times the amount of military personnel required to do the job. This waste of manpower nevertheless is the standard organization set-up for every air base in both the United States and abroad, as put out by Air Force General Vandenberg.

Each of these airfields in Japan are saturated with social clubs for this over-stuffed personnel, including officers clubs, non-commissioned officers clubs, airmen's clubs, and a service club. The personnel on these airfields are occupying their time in Government-operated golf courses. One of these golf courses is maintained by 90 Japanese at Government expense. In short, the military personnel in Japan are living like playboys and are furnished a Government home rent free, and are having their families and American cars sent over at Government expense. Each home is given a Japanese house boy and a maid.

Now, let me read what a soldier said at Fort Eustis, Va., who is an instructor in a military school:

Since the middle of July, there have been no students to instruct. We have merely been reporting to work every day, and since that time we have been just sitting around waiting for 5 o'clock so we can go home.

Mr. Speaker, there is plenty of surplus manpower in our Armed Forces and with some efficient handling of personnel, replacement of all Inactive and Volunteer Reserves can be accomplished without any ill effect on the armed services.

As I said in the beginning this so-called compromise is nothing but a delusion and a snare and I cannot conscientiously stand here and support it. Furthermore I would be nothing less than a hypocrite to urge support of any recommendation of any conference committee of this Congress which would in effect place the stamp of approval on the shameful manner by which the inactive volunteer reservists of this country have been treated.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, all members of the committee were most anxious to do everything possible for the reservists. I think all members recognize that the services did a poor job in many respects, in calling up the reserves. We are assured that these men will now be discharged as soon as may reasonably be possible. We urged that they be released as soon as possible. The Air Force and the Army will have no difficulty meeting the schedule. The Navy has had a little more difficulty with respect to some of their personnel.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD, I wish to insert the following

letter from Mrs. Anna Rosenberg with respect to the program for the release of the reservists:

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C., October 5, 1951.

Hon. GEORGE H. MAHON,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. MAHON: In accordance with our conversation of this morning, and your request, I will try to outline in this letter what the Department of Defense is doing regarding the release of inactive and volunteer reservists who saw service in World War II. The Department is making every effort to return these men to civilian life at the earliest possible moment consistent with national security.

The Army will release from active duty all enlisted men called to duty from the inactive or Volunteer Reserves by December 20, 1951. Previously, the Army had announced that all such men would be released no later than January 1, 1952. But, by a careful reworking of Army plans, and with the objective of having these men home with their families for Christmas, this new goal has been set and, barring any major change in the international situation, will be met. This letter to you represents our first announcement of the new release date.

Army officers in this category will generally be required to serve the maximum period of 17 months permitted under Public Law No. 51. As you can appreciate, it is not feasible to release officers and noncommissioned officers simultaneously and, thus, weaken the Army's leadership all in one stroke.

The Air Force will release all of its enlisted men ordered to duty from the Volunteer Reserve after 12 months of service. But, again, the need for trained officers, particularly pilots and other trained crew officer personnel, makes it necessary to keep officers in this category for all, or almost all, of the 17 months permitted under law.

The Navy is releasing its enlisted men in this category after an average of about 15 months duty. Some will serve less than this period and others will be required to serve the maximum allowable under law. The Navy needs every month of service it can get from its officer personnel but, because of phasing-out problems, etc., even some of these men may serve less than the full 17-month period.

The Marine Corps has a relatively simple plan for the release of its Volunteer and Inactive Reserves, both enlisted and officer. All such men assigned to active duty prior to June 30, 1951, will be returned to inactive duty, on a staggered basis, by June 1952. The average service of these enlisted Marine personnel will be approximately 14 months.

Thus, as you can see, even though the Military Departments have been authorized by law to retain the so-called inactive reservists for a period of 17 months, our plans call for the release of many men in this category before the expiration of their full period of obligated service. We have treated the 17-month period as a maximum, not as a maximum and minimum combined.

Reservists of veteran status were recalled to duty with the greatest reluctance. The advent of Korea brought with it an urgent need for trained men. The only major additional source of trained men was our Reserve veterans. The training of new recruits would have taken many months. We could not wait. We had to have combatwise troops at once to reinforce the gallant but thinly spread lines in Korea.

The magnificent way in which our reservists and National Guard units responded is well known to all of us. Almost 800,000 Reserves have met the call to duty. The decisive role of our Reserve was dramatically demonstrated in the case of the First Marine Division when it made its victorious landing

at Inchon. Five thousand of the men in this division were reserves. They were men who had left their homes less than 2 months before. They had left their wives, their children, and their loved ones to take up arms for the second time in less than a decade.

Our debt to these men is enormous. The hardships and disruptions in family life and business caused by the rapid mobilization of our Reserve Forces were necessary, but this necessity did not make the sacrifices any less real. We must not permit these hardships and disruptions to occur again.

I would be the last to deny that mistakes were made in the hasty program of recalling reservists during the past year. We are doing everything we can to correct and relieve the inequities and hardships that resulted, but even more importantly, we are directing our every effort to preventing this from happening again. I am convinced that the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as enacted by the Congress, and a new vital reserve system along the lines of the reserve legislation now under consideration by the Congress are the necessary and complementary cornerstones of our military security. They are parts of a program designed to bring stability and certainty into the lives of the men who have defended our country in the past and those who may be called upon to defend it in the future. Under this program, a man will know how much service is required of him and approximately when he must give that service. And, what is most important, he will know that everyone will do his share. Every young American will do his part on a fair and equitable basis.

With deep appreciation for your understanding cooperation in the problems faced by the Department and with all good wishes,
Sincerely yours,

ANNA M. ROSENBERG.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NICHOLSON].

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, I was very much impressed by the talk of the gentleman from Indiana about the condition they are in in that State due to the directive from Washington that they cannot put on the welfare roll the amount of money they are spending. The same thing is true in the State of Massachusetts, and it is true in every other State in the union. Well, we pay 100 percent and the State, town and cities pay 50 percent, and the Federal Government steps in and says, "You cannot do this, and you cannot do that." It seems to me that it gets away from the fundamental principles of democracy when the Federal Government can step in and tell my town or my State what they may do in relation to these welfare points. The local officials in my town tell the people where their money is going and who gets it. I can find no fault with it. We are taxed for it just the same as we are for roads and everything else, and it goes in our town meeting report showing how much was spent for this, how much was spent for that, and who got it. So I wish to congratulate the gentleman from Indiana and the State of Indiana for having courage enough to insist

that if they are going to spend \$15,000,000 a year or \$100,000,000 a year they have the right to know who is getting it and where it is going.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY] has raised a question as to how this money would be spent and when. Of the \$56,000,000,000, \$29,000,000,000, more than half of it, goes for procurement of aircraft, ships, combat vehicles, ammunition, and so on, things referred to generally as military hardware.

For operation and maintenance there will be \$12,000,000,000 that will be spent this year.

Personnel calls for \$10,000,000,000 to be spent this year.

In order that this matter may be clarified I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time. I desired it for the reason that I am sure the rest of you want to know how much of the appropriations we are considering in this conference report will in fact be spent during the fiscal year 1952. The greatest confusion has existed in my own mind and I am sure in the minds of others also as to what the actual projected cash expenditures of our Government will be in the fiscal year 1952. I would very much appreciate it if I might have an answer to that question, because it hinges largely upon the amount of these military appropriations that are actually to be spent; so I would appreciate it if the gentleman would give me an estimate of what the actual cash expenditures for the Federal Government will be for the fiscal year 1952.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, the President's budget contains a full statement and his letter of transmittal contains a full statement as to what the anticipated expenditures of the Government will be. For the military it is estimated to be \$40,000,000,000, and including military assistance abroad, \$44,000,000,000.

And of the appropriation bill which is now pending, about \$30,000,000,000 is for military procurement. Most of that will not be spent; it will simply be obligated. So about half of this money will actually be spent for maintenance, operation, personnel, and things of that kind. Much of it will be carried over. The total expenditure will be \$40,000,000,000 this year, according to best estimates.

Mr. HARVEY. Is it contemplated, that of the ninety-some-odd billions of money that we have appropriated or are appropriating, what number of billions of dollars—sixty, seventy, or eighty billions—will actually be spent?

Mr. MAHON. Of the total amounts appropriated in 1949, 1950, 1951, and 1952, \$94,000,000,000 will be available for expenditure during the current year; and of the whole amount \$40,000,000,000 will be spent, leaving about \$54,000,000,000 unexpended of all the sums for this and previous years.

Mr. HARVEY. That applies only to the military. I wonder if the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] would now supplement that with an additional estimate as to the other expenditures of the Government to give us a total of the

expenditures for fiscal 1952, I mean actual cash outlay.

Mr. TABER. The latest figures I have, going through my own figures or the President's statement and all I have gotten from the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue, is an estimate of about \$28,000,000,000 besides the \$40,000,000,000 for the military. Some of the things we have done have contributed to cut down the nonmilitary expenditures.

Mr. HARVEY. In other words, an estimated \$68,000,000,000 will be the total cash outlay during the fiscal year 1952?

Mr. TABER. I would think that would be a fairly good estimate unless military conditions get worse.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 50:

Page 70, line 21, insert:

"SEC. 630. In order more effectively to administer the programs and functions of the Department of Defense, the President, to the extent he deems it necessary and appropriate in the interest of national defense, may authorize within the Office of the Secretary of Defense 15 temporary positions for the fiscal year 1952 to be placed in grades GS-17 and GS-18 of the general schedule of the Classification Act of 1949 in accordance with the procedures and standards of that act. Not more than 8 of these positions shall be in grade GS-18. Such positions shall be additional to the number authorized by section 505 of that act."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"SEC. 630. In order more effectively to administer the programs and functions of the Department of Defense, the President, to the extent he deems it necessary and appropriate in the interest of national defense, may authorize within the Office of the Secretary of Defense 10 temporary positions for the fiscal year 1952 to be placed in grades GS-17 and GS-18 of the general schedule of the Classification Act of 1949 in accordance with the procedures and standards of that act. Not more than five of these positions shall be in grade GS-18. Such positions shall be additional to the number authorized by section 505 of that act, and not more than four of these positions may be filled by promotion."

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who spoke on the conference report may have the privilege of revising and extending their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

AMENDING THE AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 4475) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 17, after "Act", insert "The increase in acreage under this subsection shall not be considered in establishing future State or farm acreage allotments."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain to the House the changes that were made by the Senate amendment?

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, the bill simply applies to tobacco and allows the Secretary to increase any type of dark tobacco in short supply. The Senate amendment provides that such increase shall be on a year-to-year basis and shall not figure in the regular allotments of the State.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONSTRUCTION OF EXPERIMENTAL SUBMARINES

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1227) to amend further the act entitled "An act to authorize the construction of experimental submarines, and for other purposes," approved May 16, 1947, as amended, with a Senate amendment thereto and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Line 8, strike out "\$50,000,000" and insert "\$49,000,000."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I would appreciate it if the gentleman would explain to the House the Senate amendment.

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Speaker, briefly this reduces the amount as passed by the House \$50,000,000. The amendment, if concurred in, would reduce the amount authorized by the House bill \$1,000,000.

The bill is directed to the construction of experimental submarines. The Department said it needed an increase of approximately \$9,000,000, which would

have brought the total up to \$49,000,000. The House felt that due to the fluctuation of prices it should put in \$50,000,000, but the Senate cut that back. The Navy Department feels it can do the necessary construction work for \$49,000,000.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORITY OF ADMINISTRATOR OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS TO APPOINT RETIRED OFFICERS

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 5062) to extend the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to appoint and employ retired officers without affecting their retired status.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would appreciate it if the gentleman from Texas would explain the purpose of the bill.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, for 5 years the Veterans' Administration has had authority for the employment of retired members of the armed services without affecting their retired status. However, that 5-year period has expired and this bill extends it for an additional 5 years without any change in the other provisions of the law. As a matter of fact, this has been used very sparingly by the Veterans' Administration, and then, primarily for the purpose of employing medical personnel which is badly needed. At the present time, the Director of the Medical Service of the Veterans' Administration is Admiral Boone, known to many of us because of his long and excellent service with the Navy. It should be pointed out that this does not affect in any way the dual compensation law so that persons employed will not be in a position to receive both their retired pay and pay in their active position. It costs nothing to the Government, and gives it an opportunity to employ personnel badly needed, primarily medical personnel.

Mr. ARENDS. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of Public Law 718, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 10, 1946 (60 Stat. 978), is hereby amended by striking the word "five" preceding the word "years" and substituting therefor the word "ten."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

(Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire of the

majority leader whether he is in a position to give the program for next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes. The bill amending the Railroad Retirement Act will go over to the week after next, by agreement of the parties. I announce that so that the Members may govern themselves accordingly.

After the announcement of the program I will ask unanimous consent that the Speaker may declare a recess subject to the call of the Chair, the bells to be rung 15 minutes before the House reconvenes, because of the ECA conference report coming up. There may be another conference report that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] is interested in.

As to the program for next week, on Monday there will be House Resolution 436, giving investigatory power to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and S. 1335, adjusting weights and size, fourth-class postal service.

On Tuesday we will take up H. R. 5505, Customs Simplification Act of 1951, and H. R. 5426, the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952, if a rule is reported out.

On Wednesday the military construction appropriation bill will come up. If there is any roll call demanded, I hope, with the permission of the House, that it will go over until Thursday, because Wednesday is a very important Jewish holy day, and we respect the holy days and holidays of all organized religions. After the military construction appropriation bill, if a rule is reported out, we will take up H. R. 5118, the Social Security Act, which was called up under suspension yesterday, and following that H. R. 5411, amendment to the School Act, critical defense housing areas.

Any further program will be announced later. Of course, conference reports may be brought up at any time if they are in order.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BARDEN. H. R. 5411, the bill to take care of defense housing, I understand, was on the schedule for today. Now, it looks like from that schedule that that is put over until the tail end of next week. That is a very important piece of legislation that the Senate is very much interested in, and the Committee on Education and Labor definitely committed itself to bring that bill into the House for its consideration. I would hate very much to see it continually carried over from one week to the other this near the end of the session. It looks to me like if it was scheduled for today that we could reasonably count on it coming up in its normal place beginning next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. It was scheduled for today dependent upon, of course, other legislation. I made that statement last week. I think if the gentleman will look my remarks over the gentleman will see that while it was put on the program it was with the understanding that other legislation ahead of it was completed, and that does not neces-

sarily mean that it will follow in this program next week.

The customs simplification bill is a very important bill that we have to get through. It is in order now, and I think it should take priority next week. The Armed Forces Reserve bill is one in which everybody is interested, and if a rule is reported out on it, it certainly should take priority. Also, the appropriation bill should take priority.

Mr. BARDEN. Is that rule reported out now?

Mr. McCORMACK. No; but if it is reported out it should take priority.

Mr. BARDEN. I cannot understand why a piece of legislation the House and the country and the departments and the President and everybody else are definitely interested in getting through should be shoved over beyond a bill for which a rule is not even granted. It just does not add up.

Mr. McCORMACK. In making the program, if a rule were out on the Armed Forces Reserve bill, I would consider that as having priority status. I put it down on the program in case a rule is reported. If a rule does not come out, then, of course, that means that other bills on the program are stepped up.

Mr. BARDEN. May I say to the gentleman that when the House and Senate conferees were in session they sent for me. I went over there and they asked me if I would take that matter up before the Committee on Education and Labor and report its action to the House at once. I committed myself and the committee to that extent. The committee went to work and reported it out. A rule has been granted, and it has been on the program of the House. I am doing all I can to bring it up. If somebody else wants to assume responsibility for its not passing, that is their responsibility.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Massachusetts is always willing to take his responsibility. The gentleman has made a program, and despite any thoughts of the gentleman from North Carolina, whose views I respect, the gentleman from Massachusetts is making a program which is consistent with the probable program of next week in relation to priorities. This bill is on the program for next week. This week it could not be reached. The other legislation here, with the possible exception of the social-security bill, is legislation which would take priority over the bill to which the gentleman refers. As far as I am concerned, I have no objection to putting the bill H. R. 5411 ahead of the bill H. R. 5118.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORANO. Will the House meet on Friday, Columbus Day?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am hopeful that arrangements can be made so that Columbus Day may be properly recognized, as always.

RECESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I unanimous consent that it may be in

order for the Speaker to declare a recess of the House at any time today, subject to the call of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares a recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 34 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 2 o'clock and 38 minutes p. m.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1951

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 5113) to maintain the security and promote the foreign policy, and provide for the general welfare of the United States by furnishing assistance to friendly nations in the interest of international peace and security, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order against the conference report, but I will be glad to reserve the point of order if the chairman desires me to do so.

Mr. RICHARDS. That is satisfactory to me.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE], reserve his point of order?

Mr. SPENCE. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. RICHARDS (interrupting the reading of the statement). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the statement be dispensed with, and that the same be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, of course, the gentleman will explain the conference report thoroughly?

Mr. RICHARDS. I would like to say to the distinguished minority leader that that is my intention before the matter is finally disposed of.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of October 2, 1951.)

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE].

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order against section 501 (e) (3) of the conference report on the ground that that section was neither

at the present time under the Atlantic Pact.

Returning from Europe in the latter part of July, the Senator from Maine made the statement that General Eisenhower seemed to him to be the indispensable man in Europe. There was some cynical comment as to whether my opinion might be prejudiced by my own views as to who might wisely be nominated for President this coming year. I was gratified a little later, on August 3, 1951, when Mr. Bernard Baruch, who is certainly not susceptible of being charged with being overly friendly to the Republican Party, returned from Europe with precisely the same statement. I quote from the New York Times of Friday, August 3. The headline is as follows: "Eisenhower's job defined by Baruch—Military task of preserving world peace is put before a political role here."

Then follows the article:

General of the Army Dwight D. Eisenhower is "thoroughly imbued with the idea of preserving the peace of the world" and should be allowed to continue in his military post, Bernard M. Baruch asserted yesterday.

General Eisenhower's mission, he said, was "probably the most important task a single individual has had in our lifetime."

There was considerable comment on this matter at the time. The President of the United States referred to it briefly on the same day, as it appears in the New York Times, when he was quoted as follows:

One of the reporters at the news conference told the President that Bernard M. Baruch, returning from Europe and conferences with General Eisenhower, had stated that the general was doing the greatest job since Peter the Hermit, who preached the First Crusade, and that persons trying to get him away from his job and into politics were doing a disservice to the country.

Mr. Truman said he thought the general was doing a magnificent job and that he hoped and believed he would continue to do that job as long as necessary.

The discussions continued, however, among the columnists and the commentators as to General Eisenhower's activity, and among the week-end visitors who flocked over to Europe to secure his autograph and to discuss with him issues he was willing to discuss.

We come down now to the present time, and the Senator from Maine was rather profoundly gratified to have his opinion of 2 months ago confirmed by so responsible an organ as the New York Times, which, in its issue of Tuesday, October 9, carried a special article from Bonn, Germany, by Drew Middleton, a special correspondent of the Times, one certainly not suspect as to his partisan affiliations. I wish to read what he said; and it seems to me that in the current discussions in this country regarding our future foreign policies and the various men who may participate, it would be well to bear in mind an opinion such as is expressed in this article in yesterday's New York Times. I read:

The prospect that General of the Army Dwight D. Eisenhower, Supreme Allied Commander, may return to the United States to

run for the Presidency as the Republican candidate next year has set distress signals fluttering in defense ministries and army commands of Western Europe.

Reports that a "Draft Eisenhower" boom is developing produced a flood of anxious questions by general officers and defense officials, who have gathered in Germany for United States Army maneuvers.

This apprehension is based on fears that withdrawal of General Eisenhower's confident dominant personality would seriously delay defense efforts in several European countries, that with a less forceful personality at the helm of the Supreme Command West Germany would achieve a position of predominance in the command, and an anxiety over the ability of any successor to handle the delicate and important political aspects of the Supreme Commander's job.

The least publicized achievement of General Eisenhower in Europe has been his transference of confidence to the peoples of the Continent and the armies that represent them. This is most evident in the French Army, but it is no less evident or important in the armies of Norway and Denmark or the Low Countries.

"I really do not think we would be here if Eisenhower had not convinced our people and our Government first that we had to arm; and second, that once armed, we had a good chance of averting a Soviet invasion," a Dutch officer said during the British maneuvers.

"What will happen in Holland if he goes I do not know."

What worries this officer and many others is that they expect General Eisenhower to leave his job at Supreme Headquarters, near Paris, next spring. This is the season that they regard as critical in 1952, the period in which they feel the Russians will decide whether to attack that year or wait.

Since the rearmament of West Germany first was discussed openly in the autumn of 1949 at Field Marshal Viscount Montgomery's headquarters at Fontainebleau the overriding fear in west European commands and defense ministries has been that a rearmed Germany in time would seize military leadership of the Continent.

This especially was true of the French high command. Its generals envisaged a situation in which German rearmament to the extent of 12 divisions, the number favored by United States military authorities, would be followed by gradual withdrawal of United States troops from Europe.

I may say that General Eisenhower himself has envisioned such withdrawal as early as might prove practicable.

Under these conditions, they feared that Germany, anxious to regain her lost territories in the east, now under Polish administration, would try to lead the rest of Western Europe in a war of revenge against the Soviet Union.

To the French, General Eisenhower brought hope and security. Not only did he trim the exaggerated plans of United States planners down to size but he brought about adoption of a plan under which German divisions of 13,000 men each were to be incorporated into a European army. The French worry today is whether General Eisenhower's successor will have influence in Europe or with the United States Congress to keep German rearmament within the boundaries now set for it.

French officers also noted that no other United States commander enjoyed the same confidence in Europe—

That is very natural, since General Eisenhower was the leader of the liberation of Europe, and it is only natural that he should enjoy their confidence to a preeminent degree.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BREWSTER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I congratulate the Senator from Maine for the high opinion in which he holds General Eisenhower—a high opinion in which the Senator from Illinois joins. I deeply appreciate it, and I am sure that there will be forthcoming in the future further evidences of the high opinion in which the Senator holds General Eisenhower.

Mr. BREWSTER. I have never failed to express that opinion on repeated occasions. In fact, the only criticism which I received when I returned from Europe was that I had extolled General Eisenhower too far. When Mr. Baruch said that the job which General Eisenhower was doing in Europe was more important than any other job in the world, I think he was well warranted. I hope the Senator from Illinois shares my opinion.

Continuing to read from the New York Times article:

French officers also noted that no other United States commander enjoyed the same confidence in Europe and that General Eisenhower's successor, no matter how competent, would be faced with an extremely difficult task of achieving cooperation between the new German army and the forces of the Continent.

"Let us not think that we or the Dutch or the Norwegians like having the Germans with us," a distinguished French general said recently. "We know it is necessary, but it will take someone with General Eisenhower's tact, forcefulness, and experience to weld all these forces. Who else can do that?"

A strange aspect of conversation with these military leaders is that none has any doubts that the job that General Eisenhower is doing in Europe is more important than the Presidency.

I hope the Senator from Illinois will note this. This is the opinion of military leaders in Europe.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is there any office in the world more important than that of President of the United States?

Mr. BREWSTER. This is not my opinion. This is the opinion of the military leaders in Europe. Mr. Baruch apparently indicated somewhat of an inclination toward the same view.

Told that Americans thought differently, one Belgian general shrugged his shoulders and remarked that this would not be true if the Russians were sitting on the Mexican border and General Eisenhower was trying to unite 48 different States to resist them.

It can be seen how our European friends feel about the matter.

The French, who expect to provide a majority of the forces for a European army, although their apprehensions about German strength indicate that there is still a considerable gap between promise and fulfillment—

They were supposed to have 10 divisions by the first of December. We shall be fortunate if we have five French divisions.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Would not General Eisenhower, as President of the United States, have charge not only of Western Europe, but of all the world, so far as that is concerned, in speaking for the United States?

Mr. BREWSTER. I would not undertake to advise the Senator from South Carolina as to what his party might do. I was speaking simply from the standpoint of Republicans who are concerned with the safety and security of our country and the successful implementation of the North Atlantic Pact.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Neither am I saying what the Senator from Maine might do if he were a candidate running on the Democratic ticket.

Mr. BREWSTER. I can well understand why the Senator from South Carolina might desire some other nomination than his party is likely to make.

Continuing with the article from the New York Times:

The French, who expect to provide a majority of the forces for a European army, although their apprehensions about German strength indicate that there is still a considerable gap between promise and fulfillment, would like General Eisenhower's successor to be a French general. The British would like to see the job go to a Briton, especially Field Marshal Viscount Alexander. But they know they have no chance of getting French acceptance, and thus would like another United States general.

One shift that has been much discussed would send Gen. J. Lawton Collins, United States Chief of Staff, to Supreme Headquarters in West Europe, with Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, Supreme Commander in the Far East, returning to Washington as Chief of Staff. Another name mentioned in connection with General Eisenhower's job is that of Gen. Mark W. Clark, Chief of United States Field Forces, who has had abundant experience in Europe, politically and militarily.

This is what interests the Senator from Maine, because it is the precise language which he used 2 months ago.

European military leaders, however, regard General Eisenhower as indispensable. Their distress at the possibility of his departure indicates that they are under no illusions that the danger of a Soviet attack has been averted by military accomplishments of the last 12 months.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will my good friend and former college mate yield for a question?

Mr. BREWSTER. Certainly.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Maine has spoken of the distress which the European military leaders would feel if General Eisenhower were to depart from Europe, return to the United States, and become President. Would that distress of the European military leaders be equal to the distress which many politicians in both parties would feel if General Eisenhower were to leave Europe and become President of the United States?

Mr. BREWSTER. I have not heard any particular distress expressed in that regard, so far as concerns the politicians with whom I have discussed the matter. I believe that certainly General Eisen-

hower—and I hope the Senator from Illinois agrees with me—would be a very great improvement on some Presidents we have had. I note that the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] indicates that he might possibly agree.

It is pointed out in this article—and again I am citing it as the opinion of an impartial and neutral observer in Europe—that next spring may be the crucial time. The picture of General Eisenhower turning tail and leaving Europe at that particular crisis, when the Russians may be ready to launch their attack, is not one which in my judgment reflects the approach General Eisenhower is likely to take. In other words, I have supreme confidence in the conception of General Eisenhower as to his job and his responsibilities. I am profoundly gratified that the Congress of the United States has gone as far as it has in upholding his hand, although thus far unsuccessfully, as the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] indicated earlier, when he pointed out that we were sending him only one-fifth of what we were supposed to send him. That is equally true of the difficulties which he is having in mobilizing and unifying the countries of Europe, both in their rearmament and in the development of their military potential. I believe that the people of the United States, irrespective of the politicians, may well consider the factors which are pointed out by so impartial a critic as Mr. Drew Middleton, of the New York Times.

EVALUATION OF FISCAL REQUIREMENTS OF EXECUTIVE AGENCIES—AMENDMENT OF THE LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1946

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider the action of the Senate on the bill (S. 913) to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States, made by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], be agreed to, and that the bill be restored to the calendar. The bill was unanimously reported by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, after 2 years of study. It should be restored to the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] is very much interested in this question. Unfortunately, he is unable to be present on the floor of the Senate. However, the Committee on Rules and Administration has reported a similar bill, which he introduced. It deals with the same general subject. It is now on the calendar. Under the circumstances I certainly would have no objection to the request of the Senator from Michigan, so that in the discretion of the majority leader both bills may be considered at the same time.

Mr. MOODY. That is the purpose of my request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. Senate bill 913 will be restored to the legislative calendar.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5054) making appropriations for the National Security Council, the National Security Resources Board, and for military functions administered by the Department of Defense, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The report was read.

(For conference report, see pp. 12944-12945, House proceedings, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, October 4, 1951.)

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I merely wish to say that I have discussed the conference report with Senators on this side of the aisle, and I know of no objection. However, because of the size of the bill and its importance, if the request of the Senator from Wyoming is granted I shall ask that we have a quorum call so that Senators may be notified.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Before proceeding with the conference report I wish to address a question to the Senator from Arizona. He made a motion that the railroad retirement bill be made the unfinished business of the Senate. I understood that there would be no debate with reference to taking up the bill. A moment ago, however, it was suggested that there might be some debate on it. Therefore, I feel it would be preferable to proceed with the conference report at this time.

Mr. McFARLAND. I have no objection to the Senator from Wyoming proceeding with the conference report.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I shall make a motion that the Senate agree to the conference report, either now or after a quorum call has been had.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I will be very glad to have the Senator from Wyoming make his motion.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I move the adoption of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the report.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to make a brief statement. I see no reason for having a quorum call.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Does the Senator from Oregon desire to discuss the conference report?

Mr. MORSE. Not the conference report.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. May I ask the Senator from Oregon as to the length of his proposed remarks?

Mr. MORSE. I am unable to say.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The conference report is a privileged matter. It is now almost 5:30 o'clock. I do not believe that it would take a great deal of time to dispose of the report. I wish to suggest to the Senator from Oregon that he will have an opportunity, and just as an effective opportunity as he has now, to make his remarks after the quorum call and after the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to say to my good friend from Wyoming that I cannot stop a quorum call, but I intend to discuss what I wish to discuss before we adopt the conference report. I had hoped that we could dispose of the railroad retirement bill, and I was willing to accommodate the Senator from Illinois, thinking that that was the question to which we would devote our attention, but it did not work out that way. I do not intend to delay any further. As soon as I get the floor in my own right I intend to say what I have to say. However, I do not see any reason for a quorum call.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I withdraw my request for a quorum call.

GEN. DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have two or three subjects which I intend to discuss.

First, I wish to say that I can well understand why certain forces within my party would like to keep General Eisenhower in Europe. I do not share their point of view that he should stay in Europe, because I believe the overwhelming demand of the common men and women of America for a political leadership in the White House which will unify the country will be heard with such increasing vigor in the months ahead that it will be clear not only to General Eisenhower but to our friends throughout the world that the greatest service he could render, not only to his country but to free peoples everywhere, would be to run for the Presidency of the United States.

I can think of nothing that would cause greater disunity in our country and cause more uncertainty and disturbance within world public opinion as to America's future foreign policy than to have nominated at the Republican convention next summer a reactionary Republican. I believe it to be very important that my party nominate a man such as Dwight Eisenhower, who will instill confidence not only in the more than 150,000,000 American people, but also in the millions of men and women who are our friends among the other free peoples of the world.

Mr. President, I do not accept the premise that Eisenhower is indispensable either in his position in Europe or in any other position; but I do hold to the point of view that in this period of acute

crisis Eisenhower ought to serve his country in the capacity in which he can render the greatest service for our generation and for history. I believe he can best do that as a candidate for the Presidency of the United States on the Republican ticket. I am satisfied that once it is made clear to the American people that Eisenhower is available for that high office all other candidates will pale into insignificance, because of the tremendous public reaction in favor of the great Eisenhower.

I would say to my Republican brethren far and wide across the land, Mr. President, that I consider it to be so important to defeat the present Democratic administration that we should not miss the great opportunity to select a man who will unify the country and will leave no room for doubt as to the defeat both of the reactionary forces within my party and of the Democratic administration at one and the same time.

It can be expected that in the months ahead a strong plea will be made—and with some plausibility—for keeping Eisenhower in Europe, because that is where his political opponents really want to keep him. They must keep him there if they are to nominate a reactionary Republican. They know full well that if Eisenhower turns his task in Europe over to other able men who wear the American military uniform, the objectives of his program will proceed unimpeded and successfully. For the sake of national unity and international security he must be made available to perform the great service which I think history has destined him to perform for the American people as their President.

Now, Mr. President, I wish to discuss another matter.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONROE in the chair). The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

THE IRANIAN OIL DISPUTE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to discuss at this point an article appearing in the newspapers today under the title "Our Oil." The article is printed under the byline of Peter Edison.

I read the first paragraph of the article:

The way in which American oil production has been mobilized to bail the British out on their Iranian oil dilemma is a story little known outside the international petroleum industry. But it presents a number of United States oil policy problems.

Should United States petroleum production be allowed to go into export in large quantities? Or should United States oil be kept for this country, exclusively? And how much foreign oil should be brought to America, to save United States reserves?

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the article may be printed at this point in the RECORD, without my reading it, as part of my remarks, so that I may make further comment upon it.

There being no objection, the remainder of the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Both United States and foreign oil demands now stand double their prewar 1938 rate. Forecasts indicate the foreign de-

mand will probably increase more rapidly in the future. Foreign demands were rising steadily when Iranian production was cut off by the strikes of last March and April.

Iranian output had been running at about 610,000 barrels a day. Loss of 30,000,000 barrels in a few weeks upset all free-world markets. European countries dependent on Iranian oil tried to get oil from United States companies. Department of Justice gave its clearance on June 25 for 19 United States companies operating abroad to work together to relieve the world oil shortage. Stewart P. Sherman of New Jersey Standard was named chairman of the group.

By early August a plan of action had been worked out to relieve world oil shortages. Tankers and storage tank capacity were pooled. Crude oil and products were exchanged. At first, 200,000 barrels of Middle East crude that had been coming to the United States daily were diverted to Europe. This has now been cut down to 90,000 barrels a day, for the rest of the year. Other middle eastern and Venezuelan producers found they could step up their production by 270,000 barrels a day.

European consuming countries were then put on an allocation basis, which cut daily demand by 75,000 barrels a day, for products. Free-world refining capacity was inventoried. It was found Eastern Hemisphere refineries could produce an additional 195,000 barrels a day. And from the United States 190,000 barrels a day of refined products will be supplied by December.

All these diversions from normal American supplies have been made possible by drawing on American reserves for the domestic market. When the Iranian crisis first developed, United States stockpiles were high. There was some fear in the industry that prices would have to be cut, to reduce stockpiles. The Iranian shortage was therefore a boon, in cutting down the surpluses.

The United States Government, with an eye to the defense situation, wants stockpiles kept high. Petroleum Administration therefore asked Louisiana Conservation Commission and Texas Railroad Commission to allow greater production, and so meet the world oil shortage. Both agreed.

The Texas Commission, however, has sent a letter to the United States State Department, asking why the United States should drain its resources to meet Anglo-Iranian shortages. Independent United States producers, on the other hand, are alarmed by increased competitive American production in the middle east and Venezuela. And United States consumers have a right to ask why they should have to pay higher prices, to meet Europe's shortage.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, we should face the fact that the Iranian oil problem presents some very serious international questions for the United States. It is directly connected with United States foreign policy. In this country there are many persons, including myself, who are very much concerned as to just what is the policy of the United States State Department in regard to American-British oil tactics. For example, I should like to know to what extent and to what degree the policies advocated by Harri-man in his recent negotiations between the Iranians and the British represent also the policy of the State Department of the United States. I am sure there are in this country many other persons who hold a point of view similar to mine and would like to know, as I would, to what extent the State Department proposes to underwrite the exploiting practices of the British in Iran. I happen

to be one who holds to the point of view that we cannot justify underwriting and guaranteeing the British oil practices in Iran, because, for the most part, they have been characterized by exploitation. Today the British are reaping the negative results from the abuses they have perpetrated in Iran for many years in respect to oil.

Of course, there is serious international danger from the standpoint of the threat of Russia to Iran; and I yield to no one in my opposition to creeping communism in the Middle East or anywhere else in the world. Nevertheless, we should not play into Russia's hands by supporting a British oil policy which, in my opinion, on the basis of the facts and in accordance with the merits, cannot be justified. We should realize, Mr. President, that the nationalization of the oil industry of Iran is an accomplished fact, and that we are not going to turn back the hands of that economic clock.

Therefore, I believe that our Government should use its good offices in regard to the Iranian dispute only to the extent of doing what it can to see to it that the legitimate—and I stress the word "legitimate"—economic rights of the British in Iran and the legitimate domestic economic rights of the Iranians are protected. Here we have, once again, an international legal question involving the respective rights of two sovereigns, in a dispute which should be settled by the rules of reason, not by the jungle law either of economic force or of the rattling of the weapons of war.

Mr. President, if they once come to understand the economic facts and the facts concerning the British practices in Iran, I seriously question that the American people will react with very much enthusiasm to any policy on the part of their Government which would seem to back up the British in their demands to continue to take out of Iran more than a fair and just return on the investment which the British have in the oil properties in that nation. I am satisfied that any careful presentation of the evidence bearing upon the British practices in Iran will show that the British have been following in Iran a course of action similar to the one which both the British and the United States oil companies followed prior to the nationalization of the oil industry in Mexico some years ago. Our record in this field of international oil policy is not a flawless one. It is not a lily-white record. A great many eyes around the world are watching what steps we take in Iran, and are looking to see whether we truly have changed our course of action and are willing to practice some of our professions of recent years, namely, to stand for economic justice in the field of international oil policy. We must demonstrate before it is too late that we are not going to support a program of economic imperialism and exploitation, which too frequently has characterized the policies of Great Britain in the backward areas of the world, and which, unfortunately, according to the record, has to too great an extent characterized our own policy in certain instances in the field of international economics.

Mr. President, there is available a great tribunal for the trial of both the legal and the related economic questions in connection with the Iranian oil problem, and that is the World Court. In keeping with the ideal which our Government so constantly emphasizes in its Voice of America programs and in its pronouncements from the State Department and the White House, that we stand for a system of international justice through law, I feel that we ought to make clear both to Great Britain and to Iran that we believe both countries should bring this issue into the World Court for a determination of the legal questions and a decision upon the facts. According to my view, such a sound procedure and resort to international justice would in and of itself guarantee both to Great Britain and to Iran that their legitimate rights would be protected. It would give assurance that Iran would not be allowed, by way of issuing a legislative edict or an executive order by her Premier, to confiscate and steal property which does not belong to her, an act which she cannot justify as a kind of legal larceny. It would also make clear to Great Britain that she, on the other hand, must face the fact that Iran as a sovereign state has the right, as did Mexico some years ago, to nationalize her oil industry; but that at the same time Iran has a corollary duty and obligation, in keeping with the spirit of international law, to see to it that just compensation is paid for property which she takes over under the establishment of such a new national oil policy.

It would be well for all Americans, as we consider this Iranian oil crisis, to profit from some of the lessons which I hope we have learned from the expropriation policy of Mexico some years ago. I was then and still am a critic of the ways and the means that Mexico adopted to accomplish the nationalization of her oil industry. Yet that she had the right to nationalize her oil industry no one can justifiably question; and that she had good cause to nationalize her oil industry likewise I think no one can justifiably question. From Mexico's standpoint she was forced to nationalize her oil industry because what the great oil companies and oil promoters of Great Britain and the United States did in Mexico was a national shame. They went into Mexico and they wasted great quantities of oil. They wasted great quantities of natural gas necessary to preserve for maximum production the oil reserves of Mexico. They took out of Mexico the lion's share of that oil for the selfish profits of British and American oil companies, leaving very little for the benefit of the Mexican people, who, in the last analysis, Mr. President, were the true owners of that great oil heritage which nature gave to Mexico. As a result of the nationalization of the oil industry of Mexico, a running feud, in my opinion, has been carried on by certain forces within the State Department against the organization charged under Mexican law with the administration of the oil industry in Mexico known as Pemex. Little cooperation has come out of the State Department with Mexico in respect to its oil industry, and yet Mexican leaders sit by

and see the State Department demonstrate the most friendly of attitudes toward the representatives of the oil industry in other Latin countries, in which countries the great oil companies of the world still are taking advantage of an opportunity to exploit the oil resources of those countries; Mexican leaders see certain people in the State Department demonstrate great interest and concern over American oil policies in the Middle East, and now at the present time great interest and concern over the policies of Great Britain in Iran. I think it is a very short-sighted policy on the part of our Government, too, because in this little country of Mexico to the south of us are some of the richest oil reserves remaining in this continent. I suggest that what the State Department should be doing is building up a bridge of good will between the United States and Pemex, encouraging and aiding Pemex in developing the oil resources of Mexico. Such would be in keeping with a good-faith point 4 economic program.

Yes, Mr. President, I think the United States State Department should recognize that the oil industry of Mexico has been nationalized, and unquestionably it is going to remain nationalized. Any continuance of a negative, antagonistic attitude on the part of the United States State Department toward Pemex is not going to change the nationalization policy of Mexico in respect to her oil. But I think there are just grounds for complaint on the part of the State Department toward certain policies which have been practiced in the past by Mexico prior to and during the process of nationalization of the oil industry. I think that if the State Department would take the steps necessary to remove the causes of the antagonisms which have developed over Mexican oil policies some of those differences could be settled, either on a diplomatic basis, or if necessary, by reference to the World Court for determination, as I suggest the Iranian dispute should be referred to the World Court for determination.

We are missing a great opportunity in the little Republic to the south of us by what I consider to be an antagonistic attitude on the part of the State Department toward the nationalization of the oil industry in Mexico. The State Department is opening itself to the suspicion that instead of representing the diplomatic interests of the United States, it is influenced greatly by the economic interests of certain powerful oil companies with tremendous international holdings.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. Not at this point.

Mr. President, I think we are missing a great opportunity in the little Republic to the south of us because, so far as I can find out, there is general agreement among the leaders of our country that the head of Pemex, Senator Antonio Bermudez, is not only one of the outstanding statesmen of Mexico, but he is recognized as one of the outstanding statesmen of the world against whom not a serious question as to his honesty, integrity, and sound character can be raised. That is the type of leadership

commission, office, establishment, or instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Commission upon request made by the chairman or vice chairman, if possession of such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics by the Commission will not endanger the common defense and security.

(c) The Commission is hereby authorized and empowered to secure and establish sufficient office facilities and procure supplies as are necessary to carry out the work of the Commission. All expenses for carrying out the provisions of the act shall be paid from the appropriation provided in section (7) herein.

PRINTING OF SENATE DOCUMENT NO. 69,
EIGHTY-SECOND CONGRESS, RELATING
TO CERTAIN VIEWS ON MILITARY
SITUATION IN FAR EAST

Mr. BRIDGES submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 222), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Senate document room, 8,000 copies of the individual views of certain members of the Joint Committee on Armed Services and Foreign Relations of the Senate relating to the military situation in the Far East (S. Doc. No. 69, 82d Cong.).

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION
REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 5230. An act providing for the conveyance to the State of North Carolina of the Currituck Beach Lighthouse Reservation, Corolla, N. C.; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

H. R. 5650. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 5684. An act making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. J. Res. 331. Joint resolution authorizing the President to invite the States of the Union and foreign countries to participate in the Chicago International Trade Fair, to be held in Chicago, Ill., March 22 to April 6, 1952; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC.,
PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix as follows:

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

Address delivered by Hon. John W. Snyder, Secretary of the Treasury, before the National Association of Supervisors of State Banks in St. Louis, Mo., with reference to problems confronting banks and bank supervisors.

Joint statement and letters of Charles A. Boswell and Lewis A. Moore, in connection with National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week.

By Mr. WILEY:

Address on the subject The Strength of Free Men, delivered by Hon. Richard C. Patterson, Jr., United States Minister to Switzerland, at Union College, Barbourville, Ky., on September 24, 1951.

By Mr. McMAHON:

Editorial entitled "Threat and Promise," published in the Christian Century of October 3, 1951, referring to a recent speech made by Senator McMAHON on the future military policy of the United States.

By Mr. HICKENLOOPER:

Statement and editorial from the Cedar Rapids Gazette, of Cedar Rapids, Iowa, describing the philanthropic activities of the El Kahir Chanters, of the El Kahir Temple, AAONMS.

By Mr. BENTON:

Article entitled "Is the Medal of Honor Being Cheapened?" written by Harold G. Stagg, and published in the American Legion Magazine for October 1951.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

Article entitled "Allapattah Lions Kick Field Goal for Uncle Sam," published in the Miami Herald on Sunday, September 23, 1951, describing activities in improving the relationship between the United States and the people of Yugoslavia.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

Article entitled "Baptist Brotherhood Is Told of Albania's King by Grant," published in an Augusta (Ga.) newspaper, with reference to an address by Hugh G. Grant to the First Baptist Brotherhood, recounting his experiences in Albania.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Broadcast by George Grimm from Station WCCO recounting the burial in Isle, Minn., of Marine Sgt. Paul Moose, an Indian killed in Korea.

Article entitled "Let's Look at Record on Demobilization," published in the Minneapolis Morning Tribune of September 8, 1951, with reference to the demobilization of American Armed Forces after World War II.

THE ITALIAN TREATY

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I urge that our Government redouble its efforts to bring about a revision of the Italian treaty. Today, Columbus Day, when the world is reminded of the great debt we owe to the land from which came the discoverer of America, we are informed that Russia will insist upon retaining the drastic terms now included in the Italian treaty. The Kremlin realizes that the people of Italy are essentially anti-Communist.

At San Francisco recently the United States and almost fifty other countries signed the Japanese treaty. That treaty establishing a peace of reconciliation gives the Japanese people an opportunity to join the world community on a basis of honorable equality.

Following the San Francisco conference the foreign ministers of the United States, Great Britain, and France decided to transform completely their relationship with the Federal Republic of Western Germany. They announced that the aim of their three Governments was to include a democratic Germany, on a basis of equality, in a continental European community to form a part of a constantly developing Atlantic community. Thus, in recent weeks decisions of major importance have been made to restore our chief enemies of World War II to positions of equal partnership with the free world.

This policy of reconciliation with Japan and Germany is commendable but it contrasts ironically with the disadvantageous situation in which our friend and ally, Italy, now finds itself as a result of the peace treaty concluded in 1947. Long before Japan and Germany were still stubbornly resisting our assaults in two hemispheres, the Italian people had earned the right of becoming our cobelligerents and had entered the struggle against the German forces,

Our policy toward Italy has differed sharply toward defeated Germany and Japan. Yet strangely enough, it is Italy, our associate during the war and our formal military ally since the conclusion of the North Atlantic Treaty in April 1949, which now suffers from an unfair and unjust peace treaty while Germany and Japan are being afforded much kinder treatment.

It is ridiculous that such a respected member of the western community should suffer from any dishonorable stigma imposed by an outdated peace pact. The time has clearly arrived to revise the Italian Treaty.

The deficiencies in the treaty which ought to be corrected are, generally speaking, of three types. First, and what may well be the most important from the Italian point of view, are the moral. Second are the territorial. And third, the military. The moral defects of the Italian peace treaty are not only painful to Italian national pride, but they are obviously incompatible with Italy's status as an equal partner in the western democratic community and as an ally in the North Atlantic defensive coalition.

Italy has been our military ally in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization since 1949, and is a participant in General Eisenhower's Western European army. Italy is also a benefactor of our military aid program. In a word, the Italians, with our assistance, are striving valiantly to become good North Atlantic soldiers. But I regret to say that the endeavors of the Italian armed forces are seriously handicapped by the treaty imposed upon it.

The treaty severely curbs Italy's defense potential and cripples her efforts to contribute to cooperative security. By its terms the Italian frontiers are practically demilitarized for a distance of 12 miles; scientific experimentation with or construction of atomic weapons or guided missiles is forbidden; and guns with a range of over 18 miles—which is not a great distance as modern warfare goes—are banned.

Italy's armed forces are drastically limited. The navy is restricted to a size permitting little more than patrolling activities. A maximum quota of 25,000 men for all its services is imposed. The Army is set at a size of 185,000 troops, plus 65,000 carabinieri or national police. The Air Force is permitted only a trifling 200 fighter planes, and no bombers. Imagine trying to resist modern aggression with these token forces.

In view of the pressing necessity of strengthening the Western World by every available means, I strongly urge that the United States quicken its efforts to reach agreement with the other treaty signatories on the terms of revision. Thus we can demonstrate to the world the high regard we have for the Italian nation. The American people, concerned as they always are with the principles of right and justice, most certainly desire prompt revision. Congress, therefore, as the representative of the people, can well lend its power and prestige to this righteous cause. It

will make all of us proud to give to Italy today the sort of treaty which events, unfortunately, prevented it from receiving in 1947.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5054) making appropriations for the National Security Council, the National Security Resources Board, and for military functions administered by the Department of Defense, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I feel that before the conference report is taken up for discussion there should be a quorum call, so I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Butler, Md.	Fulbright	McFarland
Butler, Nebr.	George	McKellar
Cain	Hayden	Monroney
Carlson	Hendrickson	Murray
Case	Hickenlooper	O'Connor
Chavez	Hill	O'Mahoney
Connally	Humphrey	Saltonstall
Cordon	Ives	Schoeppel
Dirksen	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, N. C.
Dworshak	Knowland	Stennis
Ecton	Langer	Taft
Ellender	Lehman	Wiley
Ferguson	Lodge	Williams
Flanders	McCarran	Young

Mr. McFARLAND. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN and Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senators from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE and Mr. NEELY], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] are absent on official business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON], the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of illness.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is not present.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay Mr. BENTON, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. DUFF, Mr. FREAR, Mr. HENNING, Mr. HOEY, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HUNT, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. KERR, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MALONE, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. McMAHON, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. MOODY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. THYE, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. WATKINS, and Mr. WELKER entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1952—CHANGE OF CONFEE

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] has been ill, as all of us know, and still is ill. He has previously been appointed a conferee on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5215) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes. He probably will not be here during the remainder of the session.

I am happy to hear that the junior Senator from Nebraska is much better, and I hope he will soon be in his usual excellent health. He is a fine man, and I regret very much that he is not here.

I now ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] be appointed a conferee in the place of the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] on the bill H. R. 5215.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Chair appoints the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] in place of the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY].

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Chair.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5054) making appropriations for the National Security Council, the National Security Resources Board, and for military functions administered by the Department of Defense, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the conference report on the Department of Defense appropriation bill is the unfinished business.

I should like to point out briefly that the bill which is now before the Senate in the form of a conference report represents a reduction below the bill as it

passed the Senate by \$2,568,441,600. The budget estimates which were considered by the Senate Committee on Appropriations and by the Senate amounted to \$57,679,625,700. The bill which the conferees report and which the House has accepted amounts to \$56,939,568,030, representing, as I say, a cut of more than \$2,500,000,000 below the amount which was approved by the Senate. This, of course, includes certain reductions which were made by the Senate, the 2½ percent general reduction and the reduction of \$70,000,000 for research and development. In other words, I feel that the conferees have scrutinized this bill with the greatest of care, and the measure now presented by the conferees represents a sum which in the judgment of conferees on the part of the House and on the part of the Senate, and apparently of both Houses, the minimum sum which ought to be appropriated at this time.

I shall be very happy to answer any questions that may be asked by any Members of the Senate.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Wyoming regarding the so-called Van Zandt amendment. I understand it has been changed in the conference. The Senate did not adopt it, but the House had adopted it, and a compromise was reached affecting the discharge of Inactive Reserve and enlisted men.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator will remember that this amendment, which was inserted on the floor of the House, applied only to the inactive reservists who were involuntarily called, and it provided for their discharge at any and all events after 12 months, if they had had 12 months' service in World War II. The testimony which was presented to the committee by the Department of Defense, and particularly by the Army, was unanimous in emphasizing that this rigidity would have had serious effects in impairing the strength and effectiveness of the armed services. The Department of Defense was most earnest in requesting that the amendment be omitted. But, as I stated on the floor of the Senate when the matter was under consideration, the Committee on Appropriations felt that the Department should make some concessions, that it was important to release as many men as possible, particularly those who had served in World War II. It was our feeling, as I think was well expressed by the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] during one of the colloquies here with respect to this question, that the present military operation should be carried on by soldiers of this generation rather than by soldiers of the last generation. It was, however, represented to the conferees, and it was their unanimous judgment in the end, that to impose an inflexible rule upon the Department with respect to officers would have been too dangerous.

Mr. MONRONEY. As I understand, the officers were included in the original Van Zandt amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The officers were included in the original Van Zandt amendment. So we finally compromised upon a 16-month service for enlisted personnel. They will be discharged at the end of 16 months' service, and the regular 17-month rule will apply to officers. That is the effect of the compromise provision.

Mr. MONRONEY. There is no guaranty in the bill, however, as to the 17-months period; it is merely the policy of the Department of Defense as publicly announced, is it not?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The amendment as it was agreed to in the conference reads as follows:

(b) No part of any appropriation contained in this act for "Pay and allowances" of military personnel shall be expended for the pay or allowances, accruing after November 30, 1951, of any enlisted member of the Inactive or Volunteer Reserve who served on active duty for a period of 12 months or more in any branch of the Armed Forces during the period beginning December 7, 1941, and ending September 2, 1945, if such member shall have served on active duty for a period of 16 months or more after June 26, 1950, unless such member shall have voluntarily consented to remain on active duty.

So that this is a directive with respect to enlisted men, not a directive with respect to officers; but the policy which has been followed, and which is being followed, without variation, as I understand, has been to release officers after 17 months, if they wish to be released.

Mr. MONRONEY. The provision would not apply to the National Guard units now on duty, nor to the active reservists who have been recalled, would it?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Van Zandt amendment as introduced on the floor of the House did not apply to those categories.

Mr. MONRONEY. It did not apply to them, so it was not a matter in conference. Is that correct?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It never was in conference.

Mr. MONRONEY. And it could not possibly have been reached in the appropriation bill as it came to the conferees. Is that correct?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct. I may say that all the conferees have entertained the hope that the Armed Services Committees of both Houses would continue their study of the matter, and that if further legislation should be necessary it would be enacted. The House Committee on Armed Services has already been making such a study.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. CAIN. If my friend from Wyoming will permit me, I should like to say that the Armed Services Committee has very recently been informed by the military services that none of them has any intention, beyond January 1, of recalling any inactive enlisted reservists. I thought that statement would provide a considerable amount of satisfaction.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am very glad that the Senator from Washington has reminded me that that is the situation.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. I should like to ask the distinguished chairman in regard to the proviso which is proposed in the amendment to take the place of the amendment of the Senate numbered 8. Reading from page 3 of the report, the proviso is:

Provided further, That none of the funds appropriated in this act shall be used for expenditures in connection with recruitment advertising, including sponsorship of radio and television shows by the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, or the Department of the Air Force.

Do I correctly understand that this prevents the use of these funds for paid-space advertising in magazines and newspapers?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It does; yes.

Mr. CASE. It, however, would not interfere with informational activities within the amount of \$10,950,000 included in the same paragraph, provided such informational activities by military personnel results in getting some free space in the newspapers, would it?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No; it would not.

Mr. CASE. It would let them send out news releases and anything that they could get the papers to print for nothing, is that correct?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. CASE. I have one other question. The Senator from Wyoming will recall that during the consideration of the bill I had suggested a penny-pinching amendment to save 1 percent on the total amounts involved in the bill, that the distinguished senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] had offered an amendment to save 5 percent, and that as the result of various conferences with the Senator and others, the amendment was modified to make a 2½ percent overall reduction; and now I understand that the bill as reported makes a reduction of an even larger amount than 2½ percent. My question runs to the application of that reduction.

Is that a reduction in the \$5,000,000,000 fund which was indicated to be for expansion of the Air Force, as suggested by the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], or is it a reduction applicable to all items, and generally throughout the bill?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No; it is a reduction of several items throughout the bill, including the air-power amendment, which constitutes the bulk of the reduction.

Mr. CASE. A large part of that applies to the so-called \$5,000,000,000 figure?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Most of it. The 2½-percent reduction which was accepted by the Appropriation Committee would have amounted to a little over a billion and a half dollars in terms of the bill as it passed the Senate, the appropriations contained in which were, of course, greater than those in the bill as passed by the House. The House conferees felt that since 49 percent of the total appropriation was devoted to major procurement items, the reduction in that form should not be agreed to. The House conferees were opposed to it from the

very beginning. But the Senate conferees were very glad to agree to certain reductions in other items, particularly to the reduction in the amendment with reference to air power.

To be perfectly frank with the Senate, I think I should point out that the result of the discussions in the committee and on the floor with respect to the development of air power has been that the Department of Defense has now undertaken to prepare a budget for presentation at the next session of Congress with respect to air power, both for the Navy and the Air Force. In this bill there is \$1,000,000,000, one-third of which is for the Navy and two-thirds of which is for the Air Force.

I may say that it is the intention of the committee to continue its scrutiny of other items in the bill. There will be a continuous survey of expenditures in order that we may be certain that every possible reduction may be made, not in an inflexible way, but in a selective way.

Mr. CASE. I realize that the problem of conferees on a big money bill is always difficult and it generally requires compromise. I am not disposed to quarrel with the way the conference has worked it out. I think the conferees have doubtless done the best they could under all the circumstances.

I do want to express appreciation of the fact that a study is to be undertaken for adjusting our program to an expansion of the Air Force. I think that is consistent with the conviction of Members of Congress generally and it is what I personally would hope would come to pass.

I also wish to express appreciation of what the Senator from Wyoming has just said with reference to specific reductions. We always have a problem in military appropriations because of the large amounts of money that it is necessary for the military to spend. A soldier is trained to accomplish a mission; he is not trained to save money, nor is he trained as a financier. When we are dealing with the problem of Government financing which we have at this time, it does become important that somewhere along the line we should try to save what money we can by making no unnecessary or improvident expenditures in military activities as well as in any other field. In the administration of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, it is difficult to write into law the formulae which will say to an officer that he must try to avoid an unnecessary trip in connection with the normal operation of a military installation, or to try to avoid waste by preventing the destruction of Government property, or in connection with heating, or repairs and other ordinary maintenance.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is quite correct. All of us who have had any connection either with service in the Army, Navy, or Air Force, or who have participated as members of the Appropriations Committee, as the Senator from South Dakota has done for many years on the House side, know that there are inevitable wastes in the military service. It is always a matter of hurry and wait. Men are gathered together in a great hurry, then sent to a post, and

then they wait for orders. The appropriations subcommittee on the Armed Services, and the Armed Services Committee, both are very much concerned about this matter. I hope the Department of Defense will continue to do what it has been doing, namely, to seek constantly for ways and means of eliminating wasteful procedures.

I am particularly concerned about the elimination of wasteful representations with respect to the need for items and the need for men. It is common in the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force for officers to ask for more than they need because they expect an inevitable reduction.

I assure the Senator that our committee will do its best to bring all these expenditures down to rock bottom. It will be our intention to maintain a continuous survey of the preparation of the new budget. We have already undertaken a survey of outstanding contract authority and the liquidation of it, for example. We have asked for full reports, in order that we may cut down the expenditure of funds previously authorized if the objective is no longer necessary, particularly as a result of the development of new weapons.

Mr. CASE. That is certainly commendable. I had hoped that there might be some remnant of our amendment for an over-all saving to impress upon all branches of the service the desirability of occasionally returning some money to the Treasury in the form of an unexpended balance. While it is not always possible to pinpoint where a reduction is to be made, if we can inculcate in those who spend the funds the desirability of saving where they can, it would be a very good thing.

I appreciate what the Senator has stated as to plans already made for a continuous survey, and also for a study of unexpended balances.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota brought a question into my mind and also a thought which I should like to express.

We are constantly faced with the fact that Members of the Senate serving on several committees must attend this committee meeting and that committee meeting, and, therefore, we cannot devote as much time to a specific question as we would like to do or as we should do in order to keep abreast of the situation and keep ourselves acquainted with what is transpiring in connection with certain functions of the military for which we might have been responsible to a certain extent when we approved the budget.

The distinguished Senator from Wyoming who is presenting the conference report from early spring until the appropriation bill was approved by the full committee has spent endless days in hearing witnesses and studying the appropriation. Some of the funds appropriated will be earmarked to be expended within the next 18 months. Some of them will be for the construction of mili-

tary installations. Another item will be for airplanes. These funds are oftentimes earmarked and obligated over a period of a great number of months.

It was that which led me to the strong conviction that there should be established a committee, with a competent and able staff, which could proceed to follow these funds from the day the Congress made them available until the completed machine, whether it were an airplane or some other type of equipment, was put into the field ready for use. Only in that way I believe will we know whether the enthusiasm of the Army to get their work accomplished has been such that it has foolishly expended funds, or whether we have had an administration of the funds in such a prudent manner that we have actually gotten a dollar's worth for every taxpayer's dollar made available and appropriated.

I know that the Committee on Appropriations, of which the Senator from Wyoming is one member, and a senior member, have agreed upon the establishment of a staff of auditors and examiners, who can follow the expenditures of the funds from the day the first dollar is made available to the military, or some other division of the Government now engaged in the development of the great defense of the United States, in order that when the Congress returns and reexamines the question of appropriations in connection with another appropriation bill, the staff and the committee which have been charged with this particular investigational work can lay before the Senate a most detailed statement of how the funds have been expended. As a result of such procedure we will have a greater knowledge of whether we are getting economy in the various branches of the Government, or whether there is a waste of the taxpayers' dollars.

The Senator from South Dakota, when he raised his question, brought to my mind again the long, detailed study which had to be made when the Joint Chiefs of Staff and representatives of the Defense Department and all the procuring agencies of the various branches of the Government, sat before the committee day after day, week after week, and into the months, in order that we might develop what is in the appropriation program.

Mr. CASE. The Senator from Minnesota put his finger on the crux of the problem when he used the word "prudent." In connection with the military, it is difficult to direct the word "prudent" to an operation in a hot battle or campaign; but in a semimobilization such as we now have, domestic operations, at least, are more in the nature of house-keeping than of conducting a campaign. Certainly the word "prudent" would be a good one to inculcate in the minds of those who expend the funds of the Defense Department.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. First, Mr. President, I desire to compliment the Senator from Minnesota for the thought which he has developed. He has been most helpful, not only throughout the hear-

ings on the bill and the action of the subcommittee on the bill itself, but in urging a continuous survey of expenditures. The committee has been authorized to expand the staff, and I am sure the work will be carried on.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield on that point?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like also to call to the attention of the Senator from Wyoming a fact with which I know he is familiar, that there is a subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services which is constantly looking into waste and extravagance, and endeavoring to assist in order to see that contracts are carried out efficiently. I have in mind especially the subject of tin, as well as copper, as to which the work of the committee resulted in large savings.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I believe I referred to that earlier in the day.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. With regard to the subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services, I should like to state that I feel that that fills an entirely different sphere of inquiry from that of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course, the Committee on Armed Services has a different function from that of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is the responsibility of the Committee on Appropriations to make sure that the money Congress makes available to the Department of Defense is as wisely expended as it possibly can be.

Mr. FERGUSON. And also to determine whether or not the Department of Defense needs a certain amount of money.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. What the Senator from Michigan says recalls the inquiry of the Senator from South Dakota regarding the amendment which was written in conference with respect to expenditures for advertising. The Senator from Michigan and I had called to our attention, after the committee hearings, the proposed expenditure of some funds allegedly for recruiting, which we felt had not been sufficiently justified during the hearings.

Mr. President, I wish to make the RECORD clear on that point. There was widespread misunderstanding throughout the country because it was thought that our criticism was directed at radio and television alone. It was not directed to those media alone. It was directed to some of the pamphlets and booklets printed on expensive glazed paper, which the Department of Defense itself was circulating. It had reference also to advertisements in the slick-paper magazines and others.

When I say that, I desire to make it clear that the budget justifications which were submitted to us by the Navy, for example, showed that 1,650 radio stations throughout the United States were patriotically cooperating and furnishing

time to carry information with respect to defense activities without any charge at all. No payment was made by the Navy, except the minimum union-scale wages for the personnel in the radio stations.

I feel that the radio, the television, the newspapers, and the magazines are to be complimented for what they have done. But the evidence before the committee showed that volunteers were not being brought into the service by this advertising. The Selective Service System produces the manpower for all three services and, having produced the manpower, it was discovered that in many instances the Navy and the Air Force gathered up men and, just prior to induction, listed them as volunteers. It was not a matter of real volunteering at all.

Therefore it will be the purpose of the committee, as I have already discussed it with the Senator from Michigan, to call a hearing, in which we shall go at length into this whole matter. We refrained from cutting off some \$900,000 of 1951 funds as yet unexpended, because we did not want to do injustice to any good, sensible contracts which have hitherto been made.

It was pointed out upon the floor of the Senate by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken], during the debate upon the pending bill, that he had heard a program called *The Shadow*, which was sponsored by one of the services allegedly for the purpose of securing recruits. It was the feeling of the committee that such a program was a useless effort. We felt that every expenditure should be scrutinized in the greatest detail.

Mr. FERGUSON. I inquire whether or not a larger staff is now in the making, which would justify the hopes of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Thye], the Senator from Michigan, and other Senators who sponsored that amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. So far as I know, it has not yet been acted upon, but it will certainly not be overlooked.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not true that if such a staff were organized we could make a survey of the advertising item?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is quite true.

Mr. FERGUSON. There is no doubt that the advertising media—and that includes the agencies—have given of their time freely in many cases.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I appreciate the further explanation of the distinguished Senator on the advertising question. As I understood, the action of the Senate was to eliminate the so-called "big-name" programs in radio and television. However, the action was not directed at the ordinary advertising which has been done throughout history by the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps. During World War II we staffed the Navy and the Marine Corps entirely through voluntary enlistments, which were largely the result of advertising. I do not mean the big, flossy, slick-paper advertisements, but advertising in small

country weeklies and small-town newspapers, which brought in the men and provided the soldiers and sailors of World War II.

It is oversimplification to say that we do not need any advertising, when we are spending nearly \$60,000,000,000 a year for other defense purposes, and ignoring the selection of volunteer manpower. There is a great deal of volunteer manpower which comes in long before the draft boards get ready to pick it up. I sincerely hope that in the study which the committee is to make, the possibility of getting more and more men by voluntary means, and through good, economical advertising, will be investigated most carefully. A volunteer soldier is a good soldier. A man who is willing to volunteer to fight in Korea today will make a good soldier. If we ignore the possibilities of advertising, I think we indulge in oversimplification to the extreme.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I assure the Senator that every aspect of the question will be examined.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I did not understand the intention of the conferees. What is to exclude all advertising for the purpose of securing recruits?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes. I may say that the bill contains for this purpose the sum of \$3,100,000, of which \$1,000,000 was to be expended in Army areas and \$2,100,000 in other areas. That was a reduction below the appropriation for the fiscal year 1951, when the appropriation for Army areas was some \$1,000,000, and for other areas \$5,067,000.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Were those appropriations for recruitment purposes?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct. They are for recruiting expenses. The feeling of the committee, based upon the evidence before the Appropriations Committee on the supplemental bill—evidence from the Selective Service Administration—was that volunteering is not now appearing upon the scene. The fact of the matter is that even the Marine Corps is no longer receiving volunteers. We must not confuse the present situation with the conditions which existed during World War II. In World War II we had been attacked. Now we are engaged in a Korean operation; and frankness compels us all to admit that our manpower is not particularly interested in volunteering to go to Korea.

As a matter of fact, Mr. President, this illustrates one of the great dilemmas in which the free world finds itself. People nowhere want war, and the more intelligent they are the less they want war. Our problem is to find a way to prevent a third world war, and to prevent aggression, with the least use of American manpower.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, if the Senator will further yield, I had understood that in certain cases, notably the cases of those who are not subject to the draft, as, for example, in the building up of the women's groups and groups of specialists, the advertising re-

cruitment program filled a very vital need, and that it had been successful in those cases.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No showing was made before the committee in that connection. It is our intention, as I have already stated, to make a survey of the entire situation. If the Department of Defense can make a case for that sort of expenditure, then I am sure the committee will not object to the inclusion of an appropriate sum in the next supplemental or deficiency bill.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Is it the intention that the funds which are still available in this fiscal year may be used on worthwhile programs? In other words, is there to be any curtailment of the funds now available?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The curtailment applies to the funds in this bill, and only such funds.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Is it expected that the funds available for the current operating budget will be expended?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. This is the current operating budget.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I mean funds which are already available for these purposes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator means to ask what the effect will be upon the unexpended balances of the 1951 appropriation, I will say that it was certainly my understanding, and I think the understanding of the other conferees, that the proposed survey should be made, so that we may be sure that such funds are wisely expended. No Member of the House or Senate wants money expended merely for the glamour of laying it out.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I should like to ask one further question. With respect to the funds which are available and unexpended at the present time, is there any restriction in this bill on their expenditure?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There is no restriction in this bill on their expenditure, but I certainly expect the Department of Defense carefully to comb all proposals for the expenditure of such funds so as to make sure that they are not wastefully expended.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent next week.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, leave is granted.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, let me say that that does not mean absence today. If the Senator from Massachusetts will halt in his exit from the Chamber, I wish to reserve the right to object. His absence is being approved only for next week, and not for today. I want his presence here on the floor to sustain this bill. The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Maybank] and the Senator from Massachusetts were very active in the preliminary discussions with regard to developing air power.

Mr. LODGE. Let me say to the Senator from Wyoming that I expect to be here today. I appreciate his friendly interest in my presence. I am glad that

the bill contains amounts which ought to give us the type of air power which we need. I hope that the Appropriations Committee will continue building up its staff to the point where it can exercise supervision and observation for 365 days in the year of the way in which these moneys are being spent. This is the largest single expenditure of the Federal Government. If we are to obtain economy, we must obtain it in connection with our defense appropriations.

I think we ought to develop in the Appropriations Committee a procedure similar to the one which has been developed so effectively in the Finance Committee, where we have our own congressional experts who challenge the witnesses from the executive branch on every single contention they make. I think that procedure before the Finance Committee is perhaps the most intelligent procedure we have in Congress, and I should like to see that procedure adapted to the Appropriations Committee. I believe that we could save not only millions, but probably billions of dollars if that procedure were adopted. So I am very glad to have this opportunity to commend the Senator from Wyoming for reporting a bill which I think will do big things for American military strength.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. HOLLAND and Mr. HENDRICKSON addressed the Chair.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield first to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I desire to speak in support of the proposed program for a more careful checking of military appropriations, and I commend the distinguished chairman of the committee, who has so ably presented the conference report, for his activities in that regard.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Florida is very kind. I wish the RECORD to show that the bill was under constant supervision by the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations from the 7th day of June until the 28th day of August, and to the extent of our ability we went over practically every item in the bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming further yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Gladly.

Mr. HOLLAND. I wish to get to that precise point, because I am afraid that, with his characteristic modesty, the Senator from Wyoming may not have stated with sufficient vigor in the RECORD the fact that a very large saving—larger than perhaps is understood by the general public—has been made on the budgeted requests.

In order that the saving and the size of it may clearly appear in the RECORD I wish to state my understanding of the situation and ask the Senator from Wyoming if that understanding is correct.

First, it is correct, is it not, that the conference report shows a saving of approximately three-quarters of a billion dollars on the budgeted amount?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The appropriations proposed by the conference report in individual items are under those in the original bill as reported to the Senate

by some \$4,164,000,000. They are under the bill as it passed the Senate, including the reductions which were voted, by \$2,568,441,600. The budget estimate was \$57,679,625,700. The bill as reported by the conference committee contains \$56,939,568,030. That includes \$1,000,000,000 of nonbudgeted funds, which were put in the bill expressly for the purpose of providing an expansion of American air power.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator from Wyoming. What I wanted to have appear clearly in the RECORD was, first, that the actual reduction below the budgeted amount now to be appropriated under the conference report is substantially three-quarters of a billion dollars.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Florida is quite right.

Mr. HOLLAND. But the amount actually saved from the budgeted items is a billion dollars more. Therefore, the total reduction of appropriations for the budgeted items is \$1,750,000,000, due to the fact that the Senator from Wyoming and his able committee, with the approval of the two Houses, have insisted upon an unbudgeted appropriation of \$1,000,000,000 for stepping up the effort to increase as quickly as possible the strength of the Air Force and of the air arm of the Navy. Therefore, the fact is, if the understanding of the Senator from Florida is correct, that, because of the joint labors of the two committees, which are entitled to the greatest credit, and the joint decisions of the two Houses, the actual reduction in the appropriations recommended by the budget amount to \$1,750,000,000, as shown in the conference report.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Florida is correct. I am grateful to him for having emphasized the point.

However, I believe that the committee should not claim exclusive credit for economy in this matter. The Secretary of Defense, Robert Lovett, who, as Under Secretary of the Department of Defense during the incumbency of General Marshall, had charge of the budgeted items, was most careful in the examination of all budget requests. He and his staff in the Department of Defense did an extraordinary job. The Senator will remember that I pointed out on the floor, when I reported the bill from the committee, that the various divisions of the three armed services, when called upon last December to estimate their needs, submitted to the Secretary of Defense requests which totaled \$104,000,000,000.

The Secretary of Defense and the Bureau of the Budget, after a thorough survey, cut the total down to \$60,650,000,000, of which a substantial portion, approximately \$4,000,000,000, was to be provided for military public works, which were only recently presented. Therefore Secretary Lovett and the Bureau of the Budget are also entitled to credit for attempting to hold the expenditures to a minimum.

Mr. HOLLAND. In expressing my own appreciation, which is very great indeed, to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, I want to make it very clear that I thoroughly support him and the decision of both Houses to the effect that

we must make greater speed in building up our air power. The inclusion of the added \$1,000,000,000 for that purpose is proof sufficient of the earnestness of Congress that the air power of the Nation shall be built up as rapidly as possible.

However, the Senator from Florida is particularly desirous, in these days when the public is watching with such real anxiety the question of economy in public spending that there be a record made of the fact that the real saving accomplished by the two committees and the two Houses, by this final action on the items covered by the budget, of which the Senator from Wyoming began a study many months ago, is \$1,750,000,000. The information should be heartening to the taxpayers of the country.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is very kind.

Mr. President, if there are no other questions, I hope we shall be able to vote on the adoption of the conference report. Does the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] desire to ask a question?

Mr. CAIN. I wish to obtain the floor in my own right.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I did not want to interrupt the Senator from Washington, but I should like to ask a few questions.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, my desire is to secure action upon the conference report. There is first the motion to approve the conference report. Then I shall have to make a technical motion to approve amendment No. 50, which was in technical disagreement.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate more than a minute or two. I do not want to interrupt the Senator from Washington. Perhaps the Senator from Wyoming covered the point in his remarks when I was called out of the Chamber on one or two occasions. It has been stressed to me that it is necessary to get volunteers for the technical services, because many of the persons involved are not subject to the draft. Has the Senator from Wyoming referred to that point?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I pointed out that there is on hand \$900,000 as an unexpended balance of the appropriation of 1951, and that the committee felt that the amount is ample for all necessary expenditures.

Mr. BREWSTER. That is not restricted?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is unrestricted. We were careful not to restrict it in this bill. The committee did see innumerable examples of pamphlet publicity, published on highly glazed paper, the value of which was rather questioned by the committee.

Mr. BREWSTER. I thank the Senator from Wyoming.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY AND SPEECH BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I wish to say to my friend the very distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], who has an important

conference report in hand and wishes to have it adopted, that my reason for speaking at this time is that our Presiding Officer, the Vice President of the United States, is known to be a very busy man and not always available in this Chamber. Because of his willingness to accommodate my wish to make reference to him, I am anxious to express my appreciation for that indulgence. I think I shall not take more than 20 minutes to present this matter.

Mr. President, the Defense Department announced on Wednesday that American battle casualties in Korea had reached the total of 89,382. This figure represented an increase of 1,732 battle casualties over the total of one short week ago. Of the present total, 15,063 Americans are reported as having been killed or dead as a result of wounds.

I should say parenthetically, Mr. Vice President, that there is to be a relationship between this reference to American casualties and to yourself, although that will not become clear for several minutes yet.

The Defense Department's weekly summary listed 12,365 Americans as being missing in action. Of this number, 151 are presumed by the Defense Establishment to be dead. I merely wish to point out in passing that any such assumption is, to my mind, totally misleading, unrealistic, and a pure guess. If anyone bothers to read the testimony offered by the military services during the hearings held last spring by the two committees, sitting jointly, it is clear that the Allies have no accurate information of any kind to cover the military personnel who are presently missing in action in Korea. A reasonable, although sad, presumption by competent military authorities is that a large number of the total of those who have been reported as being missing in action are dead.

It is common knowledge that our enemy has thus far refused to discuss the question of prisoners in the cease-fire talks which have been held periodically in Korea during recent months. The question of prisoners is obviously on the allied agenda, but the Communists have a habit of restricting discussions to a single item until it has been disposed of. The only question discussed in Korea thus far that I know anything about has been that which covers the line of demarcation to be observed if a cease-fire order is agreed to.

In my opinion, Mr. President, the Defense Department should draw no conclusions about the status of the thousands of individuals who are missing in action until the facts are available in each individual case.

It is worthy of mention that the Defense Department's casualty announcement was generally reported by the press on its middle pages. I think it ought to be required that every casualty announcement be carried in a box on the front page of every newspaper in the United States. If there is any other question or development about which every American ought to be more conscious, I do not know what it could possibly be. At the rate of our present cas-

ualty progress, our American battle casualties alone will soon reach and pass 100,000 in an undeclared war.

It would be of great benefit if a weekly summary of all casualties, allied, enemy, and civilian, were published constantly on the front pages of the American press and referred to repeatedly by every radio and television station and network. If we measure our activity by the amount of blood which is drenching Korea, we certainly shall do a more effective job in searching for ways in which to successfully conclude the war in Korea. Our allies have contributed approximately 10 percent to the total fighting strength in Korea. This ought to mean that those allies have suffered about 9,000 battle casualties. We are told that hundreds of thousands of the enemy have been killed or wounded. It was reported months ago that 10 percent of the Korean civilian population had suffered casualties in one way or another. This 10 percent represents approximately three million casualties. The total of all casualties would constitute gory reading on the front pages of the American press, but out of that reading might come an expressed determination by our Nation that unless a cease-fire agreement is promptly reached in Korea, the allied forces are to be provided with the men, ammunition, and the weapons required to secure a military victory in Korea.

Mr. President, although we too seldom find any reference to American battle casualties on the front pages of our papers, we can find, as you will agree, almost anything else there.

On Tuesday of this week in California, the distinguished President of the Senate, the Vice President of the United States, delivered an address before 1,800 guests at the \$200,000—\$100-a-plate Western States fund-raising dinner at the Hollywood Palladium. The Los Angeles Examiner did the courteous and agreeable thing by placing on its front page a good healthy-looking picture of the Vice President and a story about his speech, by Carl Greenberg. I enjoyed the picture, but I thought the story did not do justice to the Vice President. I want to think that the Vice President gave his \$100-a-plate friends more to think about than was reported by the press.

In looking this morning at the Vice President—and I ought to say that certainly he has always been uniformly courteous and considerate of me in the 5 years since I have been in this Chamber—I am reminded of something which one of his predecessors, Aaron Burr, said a good many years ago. Obviously I make no suggestion of any kind that that Vice President of a bygone day and our Vice President of today ought to be joined as a team; but I think something that Mr. Burr said decades ago is worthy of repetition. It was this:

If the Constitution be destined ever to perish by the sacrilegious hands of the demagogue or the usurper, which God avert, its expiring agonies will be witnessed on this floor.

Mr. President, I think it a great pity, sir, that you, as the Vice President, are

no longer permitted to speak on the floor of the Senate. My own memory book, which is rich and full, includes many a ringing speech by you, who now are the President of the Senate, when you were the senior Senator from Kentucky. As the Senator from Kentucky, the present Vice President was always willing to do battle on any public question. It was his custom to state his case and welcome any attacks from any source on it. Although I often disagreed with his position when he was the majority leader, I never questioned his courage or resourcefulness. He stood forward, to my mind, as an often gallant and always sturdy and fair opponent. I wish it were now possible for him to climb down from his pedestal, to join us in this American battle pit. I can but wish that he would offer us from this floor every word of what he said on Tuesday in Hollywood.

In Hollywood, he challenged my party, so we learn from the story appearing in the press, to come up with an acceptable substitute for the foreign policy enunciated by Truman, Barkley, and Acheson. He said out there that the Republicans have all kinds of foreign policies, but that none of them look alike. He went on to relate that the only thing they shared in common was isolationism.

How, let me ask my friends on both sides of the aisle, can a Member of this body respond to such an allegation, unfounded as I believe it to be, except in the presence of the person who made it?

Mr. Vice President, it would be good, sir, to have you come on down to the floor and make that statement. Out in Hollywood your friends paid \$100 a plate to listen to you make a speech. They had no opportunity, and probably had no inclination, to question your attack on my party, of which I am as proud as any group of the opposition could ever be proud of their party. If it can be arranged for you, sir, to stand again among us, the country would benefit, I think, from a real debate on foreign policy, because both sides would be under questioning and attack in regard to our Nation's foreign policy.

In California, sir, it was not necessary for you to say very much. You were able to mesmerize, or at least that is said by way of compliment, sir, and get cheers from a group of those who, I think, were gullible Americans, by saying of Harry S. Truman and yourself:

We will stand on our record next year. We won't go snooping through back alleys in garbage cans for our campaign material.

Mr. Vice President, I do not know that that was your language, but that is the language which was reported as a quotation in the Los Angeles Examiner, and it was, sir, the first reason for my feeling that someone who had any self-respect for himself as a Member of the Senate and as a member of the Republican Party had to offer his own opinion regarding that quoted phrase. The third quotation, which I noticed with considerable interest, was this:

We ask the people for another lease of power, to preserve democracy.

Mr. Vice President, I get right down to brass tacks, sir. The administration's political management of the war in Korea, insofar as the Senator from Washington is concerned, is certainly to be an issue, and a proper issue, in next year's campaign. Did you mean in Hollywood, sir, to say that the issue of the Korean war, in which, as I have related, there have already been 89,000 casualties, with 12,000-plus missing in action, who may be dead, or in some worse state—did you, sir, as reported by the press from Los Angeles, mean to say that this issue came from some garbage can and out of some dark alley? I do not believe a single American who has any respect or concern for the future will agree with any such contention. You complimented me personally in California, Mr. Vice President, by referring to the Cain policy as being one among many Republican policies. I want you to come on down here, Mr. Vice President, and tell me what relationship the Cain policy has to isolationism. I simply want a chance to prove how absolutely wrong you have become. All I want to say, Mr. Vice President, is that I wish you could come to this floor and tell the Senate—which means the country, too—what you did mean by saying that your party is not going to look for campaign issues next year in some garbage can in a back alley.

Mr. Vice President, I can compliment you, sir, in many ways. I do it sincerely. I consider you to be of great experience, and possessing a considerable amount of wisdom in some ways. I am, sir, your junior by perhaps three decades. It would be a very difficult but admittedly a delightful task for the junior Senator from Washington to attempt to tangle with the Vice President on the floor of the Senate about the question of what constitutes an issue—and in what garbage can; but I should like to have that chance, and to argue with the Vice President of the United States about our Nation's foreign policy.

The Vice President, gentlemen, has a far greater authority and prestige than that possessed by the junior Senator from Washington. Under the cloak of his title—and I mean him no disrespect, but I want the American people to know that there are two sides to any story, and that they should not listen to a man merely because he has a title, but should ask him a few questions—under the cloak of a great title, that of the Vice President of the United States, the individual possessed of that title can be impressive in Hollywood, even though he talks about garbage cans instead of talking about blood as it drenches the soil of Korea.

I want to ask the Vice President about the maintenance of the enemy's sanctuary in Manchuria, which was not referred to, so far as I know, before 1,800 Americans at a \$100-a-plate dinner in Hollywood last Tuesday. I want to ask about the maintenance of an enemy sanctuary in Manchuria, from which we run the totally unnecessary risk of being assaulted by great numbers of enemy aircraft, to the end that 89,000 casualties will have grown as a Christmas present to far more than 100,000.

The Truman-Barkley-Acheson policy is responsible in very large part for this

build-up, and no person can be more aware of this than the Vice President of the United States. I want to determine if I can what the Vice President thinks about the maintenance of an enemy sanctuary, through most of the war in northeastern Korea.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President—
The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. CAIN. If I am permitted to do so, without losing the floor, I should be most glad to yield for a question.

Mr. MONRONEY. Would the Senator amplify the statement which he has just made, that the Truman-Barkley-Acheson policy is responsible for the enemy build-up in Manchuria?

Mr. CAIN. Yes. Will my friend, the junior Senator from Oklahoma, whom I respect and like, merely wait a few minutes until this statement has been offered to the Vice President? For at that time I would deeply relish an opportunity to answer his question, because I think there is an extremely good answer to it; and perhaps we can start this afternoon on the floor of the Senate to do what ought to be done, rather than out in Hollywood—to talk about our Nation's business.

I want to determine, gentlemen, what the Vice President thinks about the maintenance of an enemy sanctuary through most of the war in northeastern Korea; and I know that the Senator from Oklahoma is worried about a good answer to this question, as much as am I. Rashin, as the Vice President and every Member of this Senate ought to know, has been a large enemy supply depot since the Korean conflict began almost 16 months ago. It is in Korea. Too many of the dead and wounded to whom I made reference when first I began these remarks are, in the opinion of the Senator from Washington—who assumes his responsibility here where it can be attacked—too many of the dead and wounded are dead and mutilated because of the Truman-Barkley-Acheson policy.

In California the Vice President said: We ask the people for another lease of power.

I wonder if this means, if a cease-fire is not agreed to, that Rashin is to remain undestroyed in the next year of the war, as it has been undestroyed largely for 16 months, to the detriment of American soldiers and with the result of increasing the flow of blood which drenches the soil of Korea.

If the Vice President could come down to the floor and be made available for attack and questions for what he said in Hollywood, I should like to ask him about the Truman-Barkley-Acheson leadership, which has prevailed upon fifty-odd nations, allied friends of ours, to contribute only about 10 percent of the blood and the dead and the sorrow in 16 months of war.

It may be that my great Nation will make up its own mind, as it has the right to do, to return to office those who have been in control of our foreign policy for a good long time; but I wonder whether that would mean that Americans generally want the United States of America not only to do its share with respect to

any burden, but to carry too large a share of everybody else's burden as well.

I want to argue, gentlemen, with the Vice President about his fear, and that of the administration, of Russia. I want him to explain to the Senate, if that is possible, what in heaven's name has America to be frightened of from Russia or from any other source? It has to my mind been this fear which has undeniably kept the allied forces from attempting to carry out the United Nations mission to defeat our enemies and to restore independence and unity to Korea.

I may be wrong, but certainly I want those in authority to prove me and others of like mind wrong. How tragic it is, that after months and months of war, we still find it imperative to ask, Where are we headed? After 7 weeks of hearings held by the two committees sitting jointly, it became apparent to the Nation that the administration was waging such a war in Korea as the administration thought would be acceptable to the Kremlin. I do not have to support that statement to anybody who has read any considerable portion of those hearings. In each and every instance we were told, "We cannot do this, because it might involve us with Russia," with whom we were not fighting. While these decisions kept us from fighting and destroying, if and when possible, the enemies with whom we were fighting, namely, the North Koreans and the Red Chinese. Out of our fear, the enemy we fight has been given an unanticipated opportunity to marshal his forces for assaults against us of a size and intensity never experienced before.

In his wind-up in Hollywood, the Vice President said, in a voice rising in pitch and with obvious emotion, or so it was related by Carl Greenberg:

We ask the American people in 1952 and 1956 and all the years to come to learn the truth and render their verdict as they have in the last two decades. We'll get the truth to them next year.

I do not know whether that is an accurate question. On that point the Vice President will speak for himself. But the significance of the quotation, as reported, is that the Vice President of the United States said to 1,800 persons who had paid \$100 a plate, "We will bring you the truth next year."

If the Vice President could climb down from his dais the American people would not have to wait until next year to get the truth. Our Nation has been too long without much of the truth, or so the Senator from Washington sincerely believes. Now is the time to discuss the truth in all its aspects in this battle pit of ours. A part of that truth is contained within the covers of a report written by eight members of the joint committee and made available to the Nation many weeks ago. No person alive has ever heard the Vice President discuss or attempt to destroy the substance of that report. I should like to have him come to the floor and try to do it this afternoon. If it takes a change in the rules of the Senate to make that possible, the Senator from Washington is obviously in favor of such a change.

Mr. President, because I have no intention of keeping from the people any

information which I have, I want to read the news story by Carl Greenberg. It will take only a minute. I shall then conclude with one paragraph to which I have given considerable thought.

Mr. Carl Greenberg writes as follows:

Vice President ALBEN W. BARKLEY last night declared that he and President Truman will go before the voters again in 1952 to ask for "another lease of power."

BARKLEY's surprise statement to 1,800 guests at the \$200,000, \$100-a-plate Western States fund raising dinner at the Hollywood Palladium was construed as a virtual announcement of the reelection candidacy of Truman and BARKLEY.

DECLARATION

As he concluded the text of a prepared address, BARKLEY, voice rising in pitch and with obvious emotion, declared:

"No President and Vice President ever have worked more closely together than Harry S. Truman and I.

"We will stand on our record next year.

"We won't go snooping through back alleys in garbage cans for our campaign material.

"We ask the people for another lease of power, to preserve democracy."

OPENING GUN

The Vice President's speech had all the earmarks of the opening gun in the 1952 congressional campaign.

He said that he first spoke here in 1936 and California went Republican. The next time he spoke, it went Democratic, then Republican again—"and next year is our year."

BARKLEY defended the Truman administration's foreign policy and, in a heavy attack on the Republican leadership challenged the GOP to come up with an acceptable substitute for that enunciated by Truman and Secretary of State Acheson.

HITS GOP

He said the Republicans have all kinds of foreign policies:

"The Cain policy, the Malone policy, the Capehart-Jenner policy, the Wherry policy, and the Taft foreign policy and none of them look alike."

"They remind me of the man who was running for coroner and who saw 25 pictures of Judas Iscariot."

This, Mr. Vice President, is the second reference which impels me to attempt to do, with restrained language, what I am undertaking to do at this time.

The Vice President said:

They remind me of the man who was running for coroner and who saw 25 pictures of Judas Iscariot. He said:

"None of them look alike, but they all look like my opponent."

BARKLEY declared that the Republicans' foreign policies "all look like isolationism."

The Vice President then went beyond 1952, saying that:

"We ask the American people in 1952 and 1956 and all the years to come to learn the truth and render their verdict as they have in the last two decades. We'll get the truth to them next year."

In California the Vice President of the United States said that the different foreign policies which are being discussed by the minority party reminded him of Judas Iscariot. I say to you, Mr. Vice President, since when have patriots become connected or associated with or characterized by any inference to the words and the meaning of "betrayal"? The Vice President, seemingly, got away with such an unholy and unintelligible reference in Hollywood, but I take it that he would not dare on the floor of the United States Senate to associate with

Judas Iscariot any such group of Republicans, who are Americans. The Senator from Washington would relish seeing him try it.

Now if the Senator from Washington can be of service to the Senator from Oklahoma, or any other Senator, in answering questions with reference to the war in Korea, he will be pleased to do so.

Mr. MONRONEY. I presume the resolution offered by the Senator from Washington some time ago is his method of preventing the build-up of Chinese Communist bases in Manchuria. I imagine that is his idea of the way to prevent the defeat of our forces. I wonder if any other members of his party have associated themselves with that method.

Mr. CAIN. A few minutes ago the Senator from Oklahoma asked this question, in substance:

"What did the Senator from Washington mean when he charged the administration with a very large share of the responsibility for the enemy's build-up in Korea?"

Mr. MONRONEY. I do not think I said "a very large share." I think I said "the responsibility."

Mr. CAIN. It is a total responsibility. That question posed by my friend from Oklahoma is dissimilar from his recent question in which he asks whether other Members on this side of the aisle have been associated with my offering a resolution last April, which if adopted would mean that the Senator from Oklahoma would have to start to become interested in the war and to assume some responsibility for it if we declared war against the enemy.

Let me answer the Senator's first question first.

I think it was on the 13th day of January, though I stand to be corrected, that the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff decided the time had come to destroy attacking enemy aircraft wherever their bases might be or by whatever means were necessary to track them to their lairs and destroy them.

The story unfolds like this; and I do not know, nor do I care at the moment, how anyone else feels about it, but I have been nauseated ever since the story came forth in all its details. There are certain other members of the Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees, sitting jointly, now present, and they know I speak the truth literally.

As a result of the agreement reached by the President and the Secretary of State and the Joint Chiefs of Staff to destroy these enemy aircraft, the Secretary of State was directed—it was not suggested to him; he was directed by the President and by the Joint Chiefs of Staff—to advise every nation with whom America was joined in actual fighting in Korea of what America intended to do. He was not directed to ask their opinions; he was directed merely to tell them what the United States, as the command authority, the delegation having come from the United Nations, had determined was in the best interests of freedom everywhere. The Secretary of State has never yet given an adequate answer as

to why he exercised that judgment which resulted in his advising some of the nations with whom we were associated in the war, but not other nations.

I think I am not disclosing any secret when I say that, as all of us recall, the Secretary of State decided that it was sufficient to the assignment to advise only six nations. The Greeks were never advised of America's intention. The Turks, who proportionately have spilled more blood than anyone else in Korea, outside of the United States and the South Koreans, were not advised. The Senator can make his own guess, and it is likely to be a pretty reliable one, as to which nations were advised.

What happened? These nations said, "We don't like it. It is likely to lead to further trouble, and be very awkward. We are completely against it." End of the story.

We sit around here many times and say, "Why do we not take the advice of the military when we are involved in a war?" Every military leader worthy of the name, beginning last January, as Gen. Douglas MacArthur had pleaded for the same effort months ago, said, "Destroy the enemy's aircraft, or he will have a chance to destroy you before this war is over."

Having once made up our minds as Americans, under the most competent military advice we could get, that it was necessary to try to destroy the enemy's sanctuary in Manchuria, we promptly did no such thing.

Mr. President, if that is not a complete and satisfactory answer to the Senator from Oklahoma as to why the administration is responsible for permitting the enemy to build up an air force from a few planes to several thousand, I do not know what the answer is.

Mr. President, I could tell a similar story about Rashin. It was bombed once under the command of General MacArthur, before the State Department found out about it. Let no one think I am not telling the truth literally, because all this is set forth in the hearings of the two committees. As soon as the State Department discovered that we had made one air attack against Rashin, they said, "You cannot do that, because the Russians are only 17 miles away." So, until the latter part of August, when Rashin was bombed again, it was permitted to exist as a sanctuary in the enemy's own country, in the country of North Korea, to the end that a great many men we talk about trying to help will not need our help, because they are never coming home again.

We are asked why the administration can be charged with any responsibility in these matters? I asked a leading military authority a while ago, and a very honest and frank man he was, why Rashin was bombed in late August. He said, "During those 7 weeks of hearings held by you Members of the Congress"—and that means the only voice the people have left—"it appeared that you did not want us to let the enemy know he had a sanctuary. So we gave him a second bombing to get him a little off balance."

Mr. President, permit me to make one or two more references, if I may, about

this place called Rashin. It is situated 17 miles from territory which is presently occupied by the Russians, and the State Department said, "Because of the clouds, because of the uncertainty, we are likely to get over into Russian territory and drop bombs on them rather than on Rashin."

That sounded like a fairly reasonable story, except that we do not assume that there is fog every day over Korea, and except that a man now dead, a really fine patriot, who offered the joint committee testimony, said, "Though I do not think the United States should go it alone, I think we ought to have our allies," he said, "I believe deeply"—and this was months ago—"that the organization of a naval blockade against the enemy, Red China, would help us shorten the spilling of blood in Korea."

The name of that man was Forrest Sherman. He died when he was pretty close to reaching an agreement with the Iberian Peninsula, which is the western end of the Mediterranean, to make our western European line relatively safe for freedom.

Mr. President, I raise this question, and then pass from it: What do we hear about the pending agreement between Spain and the United States since Forrest Sherman unfortunately died? We hear little. I am inclined to believe that matters are worse rather than better, because the sought-after agreement is nowhere in sight.

I shall respond to the Senator from Oklahoma immediately, but I do wish to say, because it is related to this whole discussion, that I asked Admiral Sherman, as did other members of the committee, Democrats and Republicans, "Is it not possible to use your naval guns to destroy Rashin from the sea? You would not run any risk of jeopardizing our relationship with Russia, would you?" The answer was, "Senator, of course, we could do it."

I have too much respect for the Air Force of this country not to assume that it can, if it desires, obliterate Rashin. If it is said that that is a little risky, we should reflect that, as Forrest Sherman said, we have always had a great United States Navy.

Mr. President, Admiral Sherman was a man who died possessed of his pride. Many Americans, if we use the war in Korea as an example, outside of those who are fighting that war, have lost their pride and much of their self-respect. Otherwise they would begin to insist that we destroy our enemy's power to fight another day.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. With respect to Rashin and its proximity to the Russian border, I will ask the Senator, as a member of the joint committee, in the light of the fact that the State Department for some mysterious reason refused to permit the bombing of Rashin and the supply depots and dumps there, if it is not true that every bit of expert testimony we had from the com-

manders of the Air Forces in that vicinity, and other military men, was to the effect that there was no question whatsoever that they could bomb Rashin with complete freedom from any encroachment on Russian territory, that it was not only technically possible, but that it posed no particular problem whatsoever from the standpoint of dropping bombs on Rashin. Was not that the expert testimony about that matter?

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, as I said to the Vice President a short time ago, one of the big issues in the campaign of 1952 is going to be the political, not the military, management of the war in Korea. The Senator from Iowa could not be more correct. There was no man who was considered by anyone to be a military authority who did not say, under oath, "Of course, we might not be able to fly missions against Rashin, an enemy supply base, every day; but if given the green light, there would be no Rashin in a very short time."

There are Americans who profess to believe that the military have been running our war for 16 months. The Senator from Iowa has just mentioned one instance which proves the contrary. It was our political management which has maintained Rashin as a supply sanctuary available to a ruthless enemy, for the better part of 16 months.

A few minutes ago, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] asked me, as I understood him, if any other member of the Republican Party had associated himself with my resolution to declare war on our enemies.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator from Washington was criticizing our distinguished Vice President for saying that the Republican Party was a party of many foreign policies.

Mr. CAIN. That is correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. The distinguished Senator from Washington stated that the administration was responsible for the enemy bases in Manchuria. I was asking if other members of his party had supported the distinguished Senator's policy of wiping out those bases by a declaration of war. How else could we destroy those bases?

Mr. CAIN. How else could we destroy the bases in Manchuria?

Mr. MONRONEY. Without declaring war against Red China. The Senator was honest enough to pose the real question.

Mr. CAIN. Yes; and I take it the Senator from Oklahoma is equally as honest. Otherwise we would not waste any time talking.

In answer to that question, I say to the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma, go back to the White House and the Secretary of State and ask them, if they share his view, whether it was proper for them to recommend, without a declaration of war, destroying enemy air bases in Manchuria last January, and to say now that it could not be done without an open declaration of war.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator has switched his proposition. He was dis-

cussing enemy build-up bases in Manchuria.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. What he is talking about today is the theory of "hot pursuit." I believe that is what the Joint Chiefs of Staff call it.

Mr. CAIN. That is the name.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator from Washington was criticizing the administration because of the establishment of vast enemy bases in Manchuria. I do not believe that they could be wiped out unless we were to follow the policy of the distinguished Senator from Washington, which calls for an all-out declaration of war.

When the Vice President says that the Republican Party is a party of many foreign policies, I think the Senator himself, by his resolution, points out that it is a party of many foreign policies.

Mr. CAIN. There are a great many thoughts on this side of the aisle about various foreign policies. All that means is that seemingly there is but one foreign policy on the other side, which, as related to Korea, constitutes—as others than myself have said—"Operation Killer," or the pursuit of a policy which has as its only mission the shedding of someone else's blood, forgetting the blood which is necessarily shed at the same time on our side.

A moment ago I was unfair. I did not mean to criticize all Democrats. There must be a determination among Americans—which include thousands upon thousands of Democrats as well as Republicans—to evolve a policy which will result in the termination of the conflict in Korea, which, by virtue of the political management imposed upon it for many months, obviously has not gone anywhere, and is not going anywhere.

The Senator from Washington still feels as he felt on April 17, when he introduced a resolution calling for a declaration of war against America's enemies. Perhaps that was not the proper thing to do. Perhaps a Member of the United States Senate should not acknowledge the fact that America is at war with two very difficult and ruthless enemies.

The Senator from Washington has not attempted to solicit the assistance of individual Senators in pushing the declaration-of-war resolution which he introduced. That was done under my own responsibility. I was only hopeful that the Foreign Relations Committee, consisting of both Democrats and Republicans, to whom the resolution was referred, would give the subject the consideration to which it was entitled. I remain hopeful that the committee will.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Does not the Senator feel a bit inconsistent when he points to the administration's responsibility for 87,000 casualties, and at the same time is the author of a resolution which would expand the war to an entire subcontinent?

Mr. CAIN. That is the dilemma in which we find ourselves. The Senator from Oklahoma is saying, "Let us not

have a declaration of war because, per se, it will increase the number of casualties. Let us go on with an undeclared war, which will kill fewer people; let us go on with a war which is not going anywhere. Let us go on with a war which has no end." In the course of time the casualties will be 10 times what they would be as the result of an honest, forthright declaration against those who seek to destroy us, and getting the job over with.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. The Senator mentioned 87,000 casualties. Those do not include the 60,000 or 70,000 mentioned by General Marshall, who suffered loss of arms or legs from freezing and various other conditions. They were not actually wounded in battle, but they were casualties. Instead of 87,000, the total number would probably be around 160,000 or 170,000.

Mr. CAIN. I should not labor the point, but the Senator from Nevada is entitled to a fuller answer than he himself has given. When one begins to think in terms of casualties, if he has a soul or conscience he must be horrified. When Americans become horrified and indignant, then, for a change, they will begin to think and demand that we win the war in Korea or get out.

The facts, as I understand them, are about as follows: We have had directly almost 90,000 battle casualties. We read nothing in our newspapers about the casualties of our allies. Our allies have furnished approximately 10 percent of the total personnel fighting on the Allied side in Korea. Because they are as brave and venturesome as we are, we assume that they have suffered a proportionate share of casualties. If we have lost 90,000, they have lost 9,000, or a total of practically 100,000. We claim that we have killed hundreds of thousands of the enemy. It was generally agreed 4 or 5 months ago that 10 percent of the Korean population were casualties in one form or another. Judged by population, Korea is the twelfth largest country on the face of the earth. Very few Americans know that. There are, or were, approximately 30,000,000 Koreans. Apart from the number of direct battle casualties, as the list stood months ago, 3,000,000 civilian human beings suffered casualties.

The fact is not often discussed, but it is true that the Korean war is perhaps the bloodiest war, all factors considered, in all history. Unless we get a cease-fire order in the very near future, the blood which has been spilled thus far must be as nothing compared with the bath which is likely to drench all society everywhere. My own feeling is that the war's potential has become worse every day the war has been permitted to proceed without any direction or political leadership.

A few months ago I felt strongly that the Soviet had no concern with America's battles, as of that time, with Red China and with North Korea. Of course, I might have been very wrong. I feel that Russia has been encouraged to be-

come more and more concerned with a war with respect to which, under American political leadership, we have indicated that we have no intention of trying to reach a military conclusion. The other day Gen. Omar Bradley said, as some of us have mentioned—he was speaking to the troops of the Ninth Division, I believe—"If the cease-fire talks break down, we allied people have the ability to reach a military conclusion." I wish that Gen. Omar Bradley would give the American Nation his reasons for that reference. We are entitled to know. Of course, I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. We are really in a battle which our boys in Korea are not allowed to win but which they do not dare to lose. The testimony to which I referred in my question was the testimony given by General Marshall at the MacArthur hearings, when we had approximately 62,000 acknowledged battle casualties. He said that there was a total of approximately 150,000 casualties, including the frozen feet and arms and other type of regular army casualties.

It seems to the junior Senator from Nevada that whether an arm is frozen, and comes off or is rendered useless, or it is shot off, does not make very much difference to the owner of the arm. If we are concealing the extent of the battle casualties, and they are in proportion to what was being concealed at that time—except to the extent the information was elicited by the questioners at the MacArthur hearings—we may have 200,000 casualties at this time.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Nevada has placed an emphasis on this question which I do not share. He referred to concealing figures on casualties. Out of my own experience, because I sit on the committee which studies the problem, I feel that the Military Establishment has had no desire to conceal any figures. It is true that the less those figures are circulated, the less inclined will be the Nation to think about them.

However, I do have some very accurate information for the Senator. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], who, as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, sat consistently, through all the 7 weeks of hearings, has indicated to me that as of last May it was established that there were approximately 70,000 battle casualties, which is generally the only category one reads about these days. He stated further that there were approximately 70,000 nonbattle casualties. Of course, some of the nonbattle disabilities are as serious as the loss of an arm or a leg, while others are merely a brief encounter with influenza or pneumonia, or something of that character.

Mr. MALONE. Or frozen feet.

Mr. CAIN. Yes. It would not be correct to say that any large proportion of our nonbattle casualties are not returned to a useful civilian life, but we must understand that a considerable number have outlived their usefulness as a result of suffering nonbattle disabilities.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. CAIN. Certainly.

Mr. MALONE. So far as nonbattle casualties are concerned, whether they go back into battle and come home later, there may be at this time, instead of merely 90,000, as the Senator estimates, nearly twice that number which it will be necessary to care for to a greater or lesser degree, and whose earning power will be impaired because of their having suffered disabilities in this war.

The emphasis which I wish to place on this discussion is this: When we read day by day that the casualties are 60,000, 70,000, and even 87,000, as a matter of fact, no emphasis is placed on the fact that these are only battle casualties, and that there are almost as serious nonbattle casualties, and therefore the total casualties are probably twice the number reported, if the truth were known.

Mr. CAIN. When only half an effort is made we get only half of a result. The Senator from Washington understands fully, out of his own brief experience, what our Nation felt about World War II. From the minute my Nation declared war on its enemies, we were committed to pursue victory until we had gotten to Berlin and forced the enemy to quit.

The big trouble with this war—and it is a war that must be of concern to Democrats as well as Republicans, and Americans generally—is that we have never known exactly where we are going. If I raised the question now as to where we are headed in Korea, no one could tell me that there is a Berlin to which we are trying to get. We have no goal and no objective.

A short time ago there was an argument as to what sort of gravestone should be placed over the young men who died in Korea. Apparently the law with respect to gravestones does not recognize an undeclared war. Therefore, those boys were required to be buried without any reference on their gravestones as to where they had lost their lives.

However, I have one happy note. There must be some mothers and fathers, and the young men themselves, in the Senate this afternoon. During the course of last week the Committee on Armed Services had a long briefing, during which the quartermaster and the supply people of the Military Establishment brought along models who were wearing the type of clothes that will be sent to our military people—our allies as well—in Korea. I want to say by way of praise to the military people that the clothes for this war are very much better clothes than were worn during the last war, only a few years ago. I have become convinced that the Military Establishment is prepared to have winter clothing of the proper quality and in sufficient quantity available for distribution in Korea, which is to be made more certain and successful by reason of the improvement of our transport system in Korea in the past year. Our young sons and friends who suffered so much because of the lack of equipment a year ago, as they now go into the second winter of our undeclared war can be generally certain that in terms of the necessities of life—clothing, shelter, and food—they will be well taken care of.

Mr. President, this has been an important time for the Senator from Washington, who has implied nothing personal in any respect about anyone. He has been talking about his country and what he believes its needs are. He has merely been suggesting that statements ought to be carefully weighed by important people in far places, for they should be open to attack in this battle pit, where reasonable notice can be taken of them.

I deeply appreciated the points raised this afternoon by my friend the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], who is concerned about the various kinds of Republican foreign policies. I hope they will all get together and march in the direction of victory. Goodness knows, we really need it.

I read with interest a recent speech by a very good friend of mine, who serves with me on the Armed Services Committee, the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON]. He is a good, sturdy, gallant American, and a Democrat. Yes, he is from the State of Texas.

According to newspaper reports, he stated that the time has come to use atomic energy as a tactical weapon in Korea. If he said it, then two persons have said it. I believe others have stated it also. Let us only use whatever weapons are required to bring our enemies to their knees and to restore unification to Korea. If we do not do for the Koreans what we told them we were going to do for them in the first place, by the time the war and bloodstream has run its course there will not be any Korea left to unify. No man can get up and say that is a wrong conclusion. Just a lot of us have no intention of stuffing Korea into the garbage can the Vice President was talking about last Tuesday in Hollywood.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, in addition to the serious problems affecting the defense agency in the building of our armed services, I do want to take 2 or 3 minutes of the time of the Senate to discuss another phase of the problem, which is becoming more serious each day. I refer to the problem of building adequate school facilities for the school children of America.

I have some figures which have been furnished to me by the Bureau of Education. They show that in 1940 the national enrollment through the twelfth grade, which is through high school, amounted to 28,230,000, and in 1950 that had increased to 29,000,000. The estimate is that for 1960 the figure will be 37,138,000. The figures are given for each 2-year period from 1940 through 1960. It is estimated that the enrollment will show an increase of 8,908,000, or 31.6 percent, by 1960. In my State of California, for the same period of time, it is estimated that the enrollments in schools will show a 97.7-percent increase.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the table from which I have been reading.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

	National enrollment (through twelfth grade)	Cumulative biennial increase ¹		California enrollment (through twelfth grade)	Cumulative biennial increase ¹	
		Number	Percent		Number	Percent
School year ending—						
1940.....	28,230,000			1,185,000		
1942.....	27,351,000	-879,000	-3.1	1,226,000	41,000	3.5
1944.....	26,115,000	-2,115,000	-7.5	1,236,000	101,000	8.5
1946.....	26,289,000	-1,941,000	-6.9	1,430,000	215,000	20.7
1948.....	27,134,000	-1,065,000	-3.9	1,506,000	321,000	27.1
1950.....	29,000,000	770,000	2.7	1,614,000	429,000	36.2
1952.....	30,636,000	2,406,000	8.5	1,816,000	631,000	53.2
1954.....	33,861,000	5,631,000	19.9	2,018,000	833,000	70.3
1956.....	36,159,000	7,929,900	28.1	2,175,000	960,000	83.5
1958.....	37,180,000	8,956,000	31.7	2,283,000	1,098,000	92.7
1960.....	37,138,000	8,908,000	31.6	2,343,000	1,158,000	97.7
Average annual in- crease.....		445,400	1.6		57,900	4.9

¹ Increase in enrollment since 1940.

Minus sign denotes decrease.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, the problem which has been faced by the school districts, not only in California but elsewhere, has been that with the opening of defense plants and military installations, workers and, in many cases, servicemen come to those areas and bring their families, and often have with them children of school age.

The other day I pointed out on the floor of the Senate that in California there are numerous communities where school classes now are on a part-time basis because they cannot take care of the educational needs of the American youth there to the extent of making available to them a full, normal school day. In addition, they have had to use for school-room purposes, the living rooms of private homes, and certain other buildings in those communities.

Mr. President, the Office of Education has estimated that the amount of carbon steel which will be required to meet the existing school needs throughout the United States, on the basis of the requests which now are in the Office of Education, will be, for the first quarter of 1952, 255,400 tons. The allocations of carbon steel by the NPA authorities to the Office of Education, for distribu-

tion throughout the 48 States of the Union to meet these educational needs, amounts to only 81,000 tons.

In addition, I also have some figures showing the priority classification, the number of projects, the total carbon-steel requirements, and a breakdown of the total requirements in order to meet the existing educational needs of the country for the first quarter of 1952. I ask unanimous consent that those figures also be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the figures were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

School construction program—carbon steel requirements, first quarter, 1952

	Num- ber of projects	Tons of carbon steel re- quired	Alloca- tion first quarter 1952, (tons)
A. Underway projects.....	2,314	58,903	-----
B. Postponed construction.....	1,621	116,400	-----
C. Proposed first quarter starts ¹	672	50,100	-----
D. Total projects.....	4,607	255,400	81,000

¹ Represents only projects on hand as of Oct. 1, 1951.

Total new starts for first quarter equals 2,253 projects requiring 167,000 tons of steel.

Distribution, by priority classification, of controlled materials requirements for school construction for the first quarter of 1952 (for materials on which tentative program determinations are being appealed)

	Number of projects	Quantities of materials required				
		Total carbon steel	Structural steel	Steel plates	Brass mill products	Wire mill products
		Tons ¹	Tons	Tons	Pounds	Pounds
Priority classification 1.....	256	10,120	2,844	284	125,000	146,000
Priority classification 2.....	318	20,754	5,832	582	256,000	300,000
Priority classification 3.....	11	83	23	2	1,000	1,000
Priority classification 4.....	17	452	127	13	6,000	7,000
Priority classification 5.....	1,140	52,241	14,680	1,461	645,000	754,000
Priority classification 6.....	670	26,337	7,401	738	325,000	380,000
Priority classification 7.....	1,231	79,379	22,305	2,222	980,000	1,149,000
Priority classification 8.....	964	66,022	18,552	1,848	812,000	953,000
Total.....	4,607	255,388	71,764	7,150	3,150,000	3,690,000

¹ Distribution of total carbon steel between higher education and other educational institutions is as follows: Priority classification 1, higher education, 11.1 percent, other, 88.9 percent; priority classification 2, higher education, 18.9 percent, other, 81.1 percent; priority classification 3, higher education, 54.2 percent, other, 45.8 percent; priority classification 4, higher education, 11.1 percent, other, 88.9 percent; priority classification 5, higher education, 31.6 percent, other, 68.4 percent; priority classification 6, higher education, 31.5 percent, other, 68.5 percent; priority classification 7, higher education, 6.2 percent, other, 93.8 percent; priority classification 8, higher education, 10.9 percent, other, 89.1 percent; total for all classifications, higher education, 16.4 percent, other, 83.6 percent.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Finally, Mr. President, I have before me some information showing the California school-construction program, alone, the projects which now are under way, and the "new starts" which have been proposed.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I merely wish to say that I fully recognize the importance of our defense effort and the need to make steel available for the construction of military equipment, but I submit that the National Production Au-

thorities and the executive branch of the Government should resurvey the allocations of steel for educational needs, because we cannot afford to have in many areas and many sections of this great country of ours a situation in which we have a breakdown of the educational system because adequate school facilities do not exist. I point out that part of the strength of our Nation, which will be needed in meeting whatever challenges may confront us in the future, will depend upon our having an adequate educational system.

In the cases I have outlined Federal Government funds are not required. The local school districts and the local people have assumed obligations under local bond issues or other financing. The need is most pressing. In many instances they are prepared to issue contracts or, as a matter of fact, in many instances bids have been accepted for the needed school construction. For the RECORD, I could cite innumerable instances in California where the contracts have been awarded and the need exists for additional school construction, but the school-construction program is held up because it is impossible to obtain a fair allocation of steel, even though the steel required for that purpose is but an infinitesimal part of the total production of steel in the United States.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I wish to commend the Senator from California for his remarks. He is pointing out exactly the situation which also exists in Kansas, although probably to a lesser degree because Kansas is smaller than California. Nevertheless the condition which the Senator from California has set forth as existing in California is also prevalent in Kansas, and, I am sure, also in many of the other States of the Union. School districts and the various city organizations have joined in repeated requests for a resurvey of the drastic needs and requirements for the construction of additional school facilities, inasmuch as in many cases the children in the lower age groups simply have outgrown the available school facilities, and bond issues have been voted for the purpose of constructing additional educational facilities, but construction has been held up because of a lack of steel, and those connected with the projects have virtually no hope in regard to when, if at any time before the end of next year, they will be able to obtain allocations for the steel which is so badly needed for those purposes.

So I wish to commend the Senator from California for emphasizing this matter to the Senate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I thank the Senator from Kansas. Although I have referred to the situation in California, where, in view of the great increase in population, the situation perhaps is more acute than in other areas, yet I have asked the Office of Education to give me the figures on a Nation-wide

basis, because I am just as much interested in seeing to it that the children in any of the other States of the Union will not be handicapped in respect to receiving educational opportunities because of a lack of steel under the allocations.

Although the strength of the United States in facing the dangers which lie ahead, of course, depends upon an adequate and substantial armed force, yet I have a strong feeling that in the final analysis the future of our country and its strength depend upon our coming generations; and we should not handicap them in this way.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wish to assure the Senator from California that Michigan faces very much the same problem that California does, although probably not to so great an extent because the population of Michigan has not increased so rapidly as has that of California. Nevertheless, in Michigan we do have a very serious problem in respect to obtaining the steel needed for the construction of schools. Many of the school children are compelled to attend only one session of school a day, because of a lack of space in the existing school buildings.

I feel, as does the Senator from California, that if the steel allocations were rescreened it would be possible to obtain sufficient steel to build enough school facilities to take care of the educational needs.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, Michigan is one of the great industrial States of the Union, and, of course, is deeply involved in our war-production effort. I have no doubt in my own mind that in Michigan there are many areas where the situation is just as acute as that in the State of California. So I join the Senator from Michigan in calling this matter to the attention of the NPA.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the junior Senator from Michigan.

Mr. MOODY. Like my colleague, I have had a number of situations called to my attention, in regard to the acute need for steel for educational building in our State. This morning Mr. Charles E. Wilson, Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, and Mr. Manly Fleischmann, Administrator of the National Production Authority, appeared before a joint meeting of the House and the Senate Banking and Currency Committees and Small Business Committees. At that time this matter was discussed. Questions were put by a number of the members of the committees to Mr. Fleischmann. The very situation the Senator from California has mentioned was pointed out to him. He registered his understanding of it. It was also pointed out to him that the defense requirements for steel should be given the strictest sort of screening and reexamination, in order to be sure that no steel is lying idle.

I am sure the Senator from California would agree with me that at this time when our Nation's safety is threatened

there should be no slowing down of the production of military items; that, if anything, we should build our strength faster as a means of insuring our national survival and heading off, if we can, an atomic war. So it seems to me that the important question is to make certain that in this vast and complex job of allocating material no material lies idle at this time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I quite agree with the junior Senator from Michigan that we do not want to slow down our national effort, but I believe, on the basis of the figures which I have seen, that to date the amount of steel which is going into actual munition and armament manufacture is still a relatively small part of our total steel production. I am merely pointing out that I think that of the other priorities with which they are faced education should be among the highest, because our machines of war are becoming far more complex, radar equipment and all other types of equipment have come into use, and if we fall down on the job of education, we shall not only be affecting the future peacetime development of our Nation, but I think we shall also be adversely affecting our potential to operate the more complicated machines of war with which we are now dealing.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. MOODY. I think the Senator is entirely correct in suggesting that of the steel available for the civil economy a very high priority should be allotted to education.

I should like to add to the point which the Senator made by saying that the population has increased sharply in the past 10 years, and the percentage of young children becoming of school age today has been affected and increased by the fact that we did have a war and we had parents going away to war. Now, and for the next few years, there will be a load which will not be merely temporary but which will represent a permanent increase in our school population. It must be taken care of.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 5054, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,

October 5, 1951.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50 to the bill (H. R. 5054) making appropriations for the National Security Council, the National Security Resources Board, and for military functions administered by the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"Sec. 630. In order more effectively to administer the programs and functions of the

Department of Defense, the President, to the extent he deems it necessary and appropriate in the interest of national defense, may authorize within the Office of the Secretary of Defense ten temporary positions for the fiscal year 1952 to be placed in grades GS-17 and GS-18 of the general schedule of the Classification Act of 1949 in accordance with the procedures and standards of that Act. Not more than five of these positions shall be in grade GS-18. Such positions shall be additional to the number authorized by section 505 of that act, and not more than four of these positions may be filled by promotion."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am about to make a technical motion in respect to amendment No. 50, which because of the rules of the House must be treated separately. This amendment, which was added in the Senate, authorized the employment of 15 persons in the Office of the Secretary of Defense. In the conference it was cut down to 10. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Wyoming.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to ask unanimous consent that I may insert in the RECORD, immediately following the vote, certain material from the report and letters with respect to the treatment of flight pay of the United States airmen.

There being no objection, the material in the form of a statement by Mr. O'MAHONEY was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The flight-pay amendment as it was adopted by the Senate read as follows:

"SEC. 634. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be available for the payment of flight pay to personnel whose assigned duties do not involve actual combat missions or do not involve flight in excess of 20 hours per month."

For this language the conferees have substituted the following:

"SEC. 633. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be available for the payment of flight pay to personnel whose actual assigned duties do not involve operational or training flights."

It was the purpose of the conferees to make it clear that flight pay should accrue only to those officers and enlisted personnel who are performing a specific duty in the planes. In other words, it was the desire to make certain that no military personnel shall have the opportunity of flying in Air Force planes merely for the purpose of collecting flight pay. The language which was adopted by the conferees, we think, makes this clear.

It is the contention of Secretary Finletter of the Department of Air and of Gen. Hoyt S. Vandenberg, Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, that flight pay is allowed only for the performance of specific duty and that administrative officers must qualify for flight pay in order to keep in touch with the rapid development of air power. This is set forth in the following letters which were addressed to me by Secretary Finletter and by General Vandenberg:

SEPTEMBER 20, 1951.

Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Armed
Services, Committee on Appropriations,
United States Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I have seen General Vandenberg's letter of September 18, 1951, to

you on the subject of hazard and incentive pay for the Air Force. A similar letter was addressed to Mr. MAHON.

I want to make it entirely clear that the Air Force does not permit officers or airmen to draw flying pay for riding in an aircraft as passengers. Every officer and airman who draws flying pay does so because he is performing a specific duty in the airplane at the time. This duty is a necessary part of his training for actual flying in combat or in support of combat operations. To repeat: There is no such thing as flying people around merely for the purpose of enabling them to qualify technically for flying pay. The jobs which the officers and airmen perform while they are flying are regulated in detail by Air Force regulations. The purpose of these regulations is to avoid any abuses of the system and I am assured by the Chief of Staff that in practice these regulations are scrupulously observed and no abuses are tolerated.

I will not comment on the other matters covered by General Vandenberg's letter—the 100 hours a year minimum, the need for our maintaining a mobilization potential, and the like—as these are covered adequately in the general's letter.

I shall be very glad, if you deem it advisable, to appear at any time and testify to the above. The same also applies, of course, to General Vandenberg and anyone else in the Air Force whom you might wish to call.

I am addressing a similar letter to Chairman MAHON, House Appropriations Subcommittee on Armed Services.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS K. FINLETTER.

SEPTEMBER 18, 1951.

Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Chairman, Armed Services
Subcommittee,
Senate Appropriations Committee,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: The Senate amendment to fiscal year 1952 appropriations act would, if finally enacted into law, create new and serious difficulties in the administration and operation of the Air Force. I know that you have a complete knowledge of this subject and that other members of the Armed Services Subcommittee are also well informed as a result of the thoroughness of the hearings on military expenditures which you have conducted. But the consequences of hasty action, resulting from a lack of understanding on the part of others, could be so unfortunate that I must express some of the reasons for my concern.

The obvious intent and desire of the sponsor and those who voted for the amendment is to effect an economy in the operations of Air Force, Navy, and Marine Corps aviation. However, I want to outline for you just how this amendment, in actual operations, will have exactly the opposite effect from that desired by the Senate and will in fact impair the current effort to increase the air capabilities of our country.

The Air Force has provided in its fiscal year 1952 budget program for an end-year pilot strength of 52,400 and 13,100 other rated (navigators, bombardiers, and observers). Our actual requirements for sustained combat operations are considerably higher and, if war should occur by June 30, 1952, we would be hard-pressed to carry out our assigned combat missions. However, these figures reflect our most realistic capabilities during this fiscal year, and represent a considered risk minimum which should be improved as soon as additional aircraft and facilities permit. Our capability to maintain this rated personnel strength proficient and ready for immediate combat operations is based upon the flight requirement necessary for flight proficiency which is, in the case of pilots, 100 hours a year. Of this

total, 20 hours must be by instrument and 15 hours by night. While a higher flight requirement would be beneficial and desirable, we could not, even if additional appropriations were made available, raise this total to 240 hours per year as required by the amendment. It is neither economically sound nor actually possible with the aircraft and bases which the Air Force will have available during the current and the next fiscal year. Hence, the only alternative would be to remove from flying status a sufficient number of pilots to enable the balance, utilizing to the maximum capacity available aircraft and facilities, to meet the 20-hour flight requirement. It is estimated the effect of such action would be to eliminate in excess of 10,000 pilots from our active-duty inventory. This, in turn, would further aggravate our pilot deficiency with respect to conducting sustained combat operations. To me, this is by far the most serious aspect of the proposed amendment.

The Air Force would be incapable of rapid expansion upon the outbreak of war and could not replace combat attrition in the early months of the war. Under the present system of maintaining flight proficiency, pilots currently on administrative duties would, in the event of war, be rapidly relieved by reserves and civilians and assigned to combat-flying duties. If these pilots have not been flying, they will require refreshing. This refresher training would require 125 hours of flying and, even under a war acceleration and assuming needed facilities and aircraft available, would require at least 3 months. These would be three very vital months after the outbreak of war; they could lose the war.

As you know, it has been our policy to order removal from flying status those pilots who fail to show the necessary enthusiasm and determination to gain the experience and maintain the degree of skill our standards require. If many pilots were to be deprived of flight pay simply because it is now impossible to allow all of them to fly 20 hours each month, fewer pilots, particularly among those of the higher grades who must also perform heavy administrative duties, would continue to make the intense extra effort required to maintain military flying ability. The morale of those who remained would also be seriously damaged by a withdrawal of recognition for their professional achievements and qualifications as capable airmen.

Many pilots now in combat in Korea were discharging heavy administrative responsibilities in addition to their flying duties a few months ago. Many pilots having combat assignments today will have administrative assignments a few months from now. These men now in combat are just as interested in the future effects of this amendment as anyone else, and they will be just as puzzled concerning how it could be equitably administered.

Decisions that certain "duties" required flying more than 20 hours per month while other "duties" required flying less than 20 hours per month would, in many cases, have to be arbitrary. The amendment in question would create constant disagreements, interpretations, and reinterpretations concerning who should get the so-called flying assignments, which assignments should be classified "flying" and which should be "nonflying." It would be virtually impossible to administer and from the morale viewpoint most damaging. Units en route to actual combat areas, as well as those deployed to Alaska and the Northeast, often cannot fly an average of 20 hours per pilot per month. Squadrons are sometimes grounded temporarily because of airplane difficulties. Pilots traveling to a combat assignment could easily fail to qualify for flight status for 1 or 2 months. I am sure you can appreciate the administrative and morale difficulties inherent in these situations.

Another area of service which would be completely disrupted by the amendment would be the Air Reserve and Air National Guard. Our Reserves are now expected to fly about 1 week end per month to maintain their proficiency. To meet a requirement of 20 hours per month would require our reservists to fly at least every week end per month, which is not only unreasonable but aircraft and facilities are not available to support such a program.

The impression created during the Senate debate is unfortunate and is having a disturbing effect. Allegations of corruption and abuses were made, yet no specific charges or incidents were cited. Not only does the Air Force scrupulously comply with the provisions of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 and Executive Order No. 10152 of August 1950, but it imposes substantially increased requirements which all flying personnel must meet in order to remain on flying status. I believe the evidence you so ably presented in opposition to the amendment substantiates this contention. If any specific instances can be cited wherein we have failed in this respect, we would welcome such information and I assure you immediate corrective action will be taken.

I am sure you will agree that the adverse effects of this amendment could be so serious as to justify my requesting that you bring these facts and others of which you are so well aware to the attention of any who might help to avoid the consequences I have described. It is my view that those who proposed and supported the amendment in question did so because of misinformation and misunderstandings, which no one could correct at once but which might be corrected now. I have confidence that this will be accomplished.

I shall be glad to appear personally before your subcommittee or the joint conferees to present such additional information as you or any other member may desire.

Sincerely,

HOYT S. VANDENBERG,
Chief of Staff, United States Air Force.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND JUDICIARY APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4740) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The report was read.

(For conference report, see pp. 13155-13156, House proceedings, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 10, 1951.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I move that the conference report be adopted. I think the Chair had better lay before the Senate the action of the House on the amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair may state that that is not generally done until the conference report has been agreed to.

Mr. McCARRAN. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I desire to speak on the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Action, of course, comes first on the conference report, and then the Senate will vote on the amendments which are in disagreement.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I desire to raise a question in connection with the conference report, and to ask that it be rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Very well; that is the pending question.

Mr. FERGUSON. That appears to be the only action the Senator from Michigan can take at the present time, in order to obtain the relief to which he feels he is entitled and to which the Senate is entitled.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask that the conference report be rejected, because it is the only action which can be taken at this time, in order to reach the objective which I think the Senate of the United States should reach. That is the restoration of the so-called Byrd publicity amendment.

It was indicated that this conference report was signed by all the conferees. I know it was reported in order by the clerk, but I want to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that three members of the conference on the part of the House did not approve the conference report in relation to action in dropping one of the Senate amendments. Three of the Senate conferees likewise did not accept the conference report because of its deletion of Senate amendment numbered 106, which is the publicity amendment.

Mr. President, Senate amendment 106 is section 605 of this appropriation bill as it was reported from committee and passed the Senate without objection. The Senate conferees have receded from the amendment and it is not in the bill as it lies before us as a conference report. I want to read it to the Senate at this time so there will be no misunderstanding of the issue before us:

SEC. 605. No part of the money appropriated by this act to any department or made available for expenditure by any corporation contained in this act which is in excess of 75 percent of the amount required to pay the compensation of all persons the aggregate budget estimates for personal services heretofore submitted to the Congress for the fiscal year 1952 contemplated would be employed by such department or corporation during such fiscal year in the performance of—

(1) functions performed by a person designated as an information specialist, information and editorial specialist, publications and information coordinator, press relations officer or counsel, photographer, radio expert, television expert, motion-picture expert, or publicity expert, or designated by any similar title, or

(2) functions performed by persons who assist persons performing the functions de-

scribed in (1) in drafting, preparing, editing, typing, duplicating, or disseminating public information publications or releases, radio or television scripts, magazine articles, photographs, motion pictures, and similar material,

shall be available to pay the compensation of persons performing the functions described in (1) or (2). No person whose only performance of the functions described in (1) or (2) of the preceding sentence is in activities necessary for the enforcement of law, promotion of safety of human life, dissemination of weather information, or scientific experimentation, or whose compensation is paid from funds appropriated specifically for International Information and Educational Activities shall be deemed to be engaged in the performance of the functions so described.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Is that the Byrd amendment?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is the so-called Byrd amendment, sponsored by the senior Senator from Virginia and myself. The Senator from Virginia and the senior Senator from Michigan sponsored a similar amendment in connection with each of the other appropriations acts. It was omitted from the Labor-Federal Security Appropriation Act but was later made retroactively applicable to that law by a provision in the first supplemental appropriation bill.

To boil it down, Mr. President, this amendment was an attempt by Congress to limit the use of funds for publicity and propaganda activities to 75 percent of the amount asked in the budget estimates. There were exceptions. One of the exceptions was for the benefit of what we call the Voice of America in the State Department, so that it could function without hindrance. All the ramifications of the Voice of America were exempted from the operation of this particular amendment. So, with specified exceptions, the amendment applied a 25-percent cut against the budget estimates for publicity and propaganda activities in the various departments covered by the bill. That included appropriations for the State Department, and also for the Department of Commerce and the Department of Justice. I find nowhere that the Commerce Department has objected to this amendment; I find nowhere that the Department of Justice has objected. There has been no objection from any of the other departments or agencies to whom similar restrictions have been applied. The only resistance comes from the State Department, which indicates that here, for some special reason, we have touched a very sore spot.

I am, indeed, very sorry that the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is not able to be on the floor because of a very serious illness in his family. I know how strongly he feels about this particular amendment. The Senator from Michigan has on many occasions discussed with him the question involved. It has been a thorn in the side of both Houses of Congress for many years.

As far back as 1913 a statute was passed barring public-relations activities except as specifically authorized. Later, an attempt was made to limit this activity by saying it was illegal to use the money for lobbying purposes. Neither has been effective because we could not tell when a department would use any number of its employees on propaganda work, giving out information to the public. So we find that the rule has been violated many, many times. The distinguished Senator from Virginia and other Members of the Senate felt there was only one way to reach this problem, and that was to try to cut down on the amount of money available to the propaganda machines of the various departments and bureaus of the Government. We figured that the way to do that was to cut down 25 percent from the budget estimates, which gave ample room for the legitimate services of public information.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator yielding. I joined him in his work on this item for a reason which I should like to bring to his attention. I do not think he has mentioned it. In the Treasury appropriation bill, Public Law 111, this clause was included. In the independent offices appropriation bill, Public Law 137, it was included. In the Department of the Interior appropriation bill, Public Law 136, it was included. In the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill, Public Law 135, it was included, and I am informed that it was included in the Department of Labor and Federal Security appropriation bill. In other words, the paragraph which the Senator is discussing, which he urged, and on which the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and I joined him, is in every other major appropriation bill.

I should also like to invite attention to the fact that the following provision was incorporated in the first supplemental appropriation bill:

Any funds provided by this act shall not be available for compensation of persons performing domestic information functions or related supporting functions in excess of 50 percent of the amount provided herein.

I also invite attention to the fact that on October 10, 1951, Representative SMITH of Wisconsin offered a similar amendment to the second supplemental appropriation bill, and Representative MAHON agreed to put it in the bill. So that when it is taken out of this bill it is made the one exception of all the appropriation bills this year. For that reason the Senator from Michigan is being consistent in what he is now trying to do.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Mr. President, I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from Michigan that I joined in supporting the provision which has just been referred to by the Senator

from Michigan and the Senator from Massachusetts. I thought it was an excellent way to approach this troublesome question that so many of us have heard about and as to which so many discordant notes have developed. I should like to ask this question: Do I understand correctly that the amendment has been stricken out by the conferees?

Mr. FERGUSON. The entire amendment has been stricken out.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. It is completely eliminated.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Can the Senator from Michigan point out in what way, logically and honestly, with that amendment retained, the department affected by this bill would actually have been curtailed?

Mr. FERGUSON. He cannot.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. MOODY. I am confident my distinguished colleague is interested with me in keeping the channels of information open between our foreign policy and the people. If the Senator will recall, and I am sure he does, a week ago there was widespread criticism of a security order which was issued by the President of the United States. As the Senator knows, I personally disagreed with the wording of that order. I felt that while the President and his adviser, Mr. Short, were trying to handle a very difficult problem, the problem of keeping our military information away from the enemy, while, at the same time, keeping the channels of information open, it had been done in an inadvisable way. I suggested at the time that some of the more experienced Washington newspaper men should be called in to advise on the question.

I merely want to say to my senior colleague, for whom I have great respect, as he knows, that it seems to me at this time, when there is so much controversy about the foreign policy of the United States, when there is in the Senate severe criticism of that policy, that when any organization in the country, such as a business men's organization, the Detroit Board of Commerce, the American Legion, or the Veterans of Foreign Wars request information there should be persons on hand to make factual reports to them. As the junior Senator from Kentucky said a few weeks ago, if they want reports they cannot get them from the elevator boys at the State Department. There must be competent persons to provide them.

I think the distinguished Senator may remember that one of the chief officials of this particular agency accompanied the Senator and myself on a trip abroad for the purpose of helping to provide more information about the foreign policy of the United States. It seems to me it would be very, very bad business to chop away, for the sake of saving a very small amount of money, the men whose responsibility it is to keep the channels of information open between the Department of State and the people. If

our foreign policy is wrong, it should be changed; and the way it should be changed is to have the information laid before the American people so that they can question the men who represent the department and by their questions record their objections to the policy. If it is right, the people have a right to know that, too. They have a right, in either event, to ask questions and to have those questions answered.

Mr. FERGUSON. I recognize the fact that the junior Senator from Michigan does not always agree with the senior Senator on questions of economy, and we are now discussing a question of economy. But as the Senator from Virginia said in one of his remarks when this amendment was first being offered on another bill, "I well recognize the need for the dissemination of information. I have no objection to it. It is my belief that the additional reduction would not in any way affect the legitimate efforts of agencies in disseminating information and answering requests from Members of Congress and the public generally."

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. FERGUSON. In a moment. There is no attempt here to interfere with the State Department's replying when it receives a letter from the Board of Commerce of Detroit or of any other city. When we consider the millions of dollars which are appropriated for clerk hire and other help, when we consider that this amendment leaves 75 percent of the funds requested for public information, we can realize that there is certainly plenty of money provided to cover any such dissemination of news as is desired, either to Members of Congress or to the public generally.

Before I yield, I should like to read from the report of the Senate committee which put this amendment in the bill, so that it will be in the RECORD at this place as making absolutely clear what this amendment is designed to accomplish:

The committee recommends an amendment to limit the number of information specialists. This amendment has been included in several other appropriation bills. In recommending this amendment, the committee has made several changes to cover peculiar situations that exist within the departments covered by this bill.

To digress for a moment, the pending bill covers not only the State Department, but it covers the Department of Commerce and the Department of Justice as well. Each of the departments required certain exemptions.

I read further from the report:

The committee agrees with the objectives of the amendment, which is to curtail the publicizing of the departments.

That is the point, "the publicizing of the departments."

However, the committee believes that it is not the intent of the amendment to curtail the dissemination of information which is necessary for enforcement of law by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Immigration and Naturalization Service; the promotion of safety of human life by such agencies as the Civil Aeronautics Administration; the dissemination of weather information; or, scientific experimentation by such agencies as the National Bureau of Standards and

Public Law 179 - 82d Congress
Chapter 512 - 1st Session
H. R. 5054

AN ACT

All 65 Stat. 423.

Making appropriations for the National Security Council, the National Security Resources Board, and for military functions administered by the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the National Security Council, the National Security Resources Board, and for military functions administered by the Department of Defense, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, namely:

Department of
Defense Approp-
riation Act,
1952.

TITLE I

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the National Security Council, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates not in excess of \$50 per diem for individuals; acceptance and utilization of voluntary and uncompensated services; and expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with work related to the activity of the Council; \$160,000.

60 Stat. 810.

NATIONAL SECURITY RESOURCES BOARD

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the National Security Resources Board; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates for individuals not in excess of \$50 per diem and contracts with temporary or part-time employees may be renewed annually; expenses of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the work of the National Security Resources Board; hire of passenger motor vehicles; reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services for protection of confidential files; not to exceed \$8,000 for newspapers and periodicals; and not to exceed \$10,000 for emergency and extraordinary expenses, to be expended under the direction of the Chairman for such purposes as he deems proper, and his determination thereon shall be final and conclusive; \$1,600,000.

60 Stat. 810.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

MILITARY FUNCTIONS

TITLE II

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the Armed Forces Policy Council, the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Joint Staff, the Munitions Board, and the Research and Development Board, including purchase (not to exceed five for replacement only, including one at not to exceed \$4,500) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; and not to exceed \$60,000 for emergency and extraordinary expenses, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of

Defense for such purposes as he deems proper, and his determination thereon shall be final and conclusive; \$14,100,000.

CLAIMS

For payment of claims by the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the Army (except as provided in appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army), Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force, as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 946; 28 U. S. C. 2672; 31 U. S. C. 222c, 222e, 223b, 223d, 224d; 34 U. S. C. 600; 35 U. S. C. 91; 39 U. S. C. 135; 46 U. S. C. 797; Act of November 15, 1945, 59 Stat. 582); claims (not to exceed \$1,000 in any one case) for damages to or loss of private property incident to the operation of Army and Air National Guard camps of instruction, either during the stay of units of said organizations at such camps or while en route thereto or therefrom; claims, as authorized by law, for damage to property of railroads under training contracts; and repayment of amounts determined by the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force, or officers designated by them, to have been erroneously collected from military and civilian personnel of the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force or from States, Territories, or the District of Columbia, or members of National Guard units thereof; \$5,000,000.

RETIRED PAY

For retired pay and retirement pay, as authorized by law, of military personnel on the retired lists of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and the Air Force, including the reserve components thereof; and retainer pay for personnel of the inactive Fleet Reserve; \$345,000,000: *Provided*, That no part of such sum shall be used to pay the retired or retirement pay of any commissioned member of the Regular Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Air Force who is voluntarily retired after the date of enactment of this Act, unless such member was retired because of (1) being unfit to perform the duties of his office, rank, grade, or rating by reason of a physical disability incurred in line of duty, or (2) achieving the age at which retirement is required by law, or (3) whose application is approved in writing by the Secretary of Defense stating that the retirement is in the best interests of the service, or, is required to avoid cases of individual hardship.

CONTINGENCIES

For emergencies and extraordinary expenses arising in the Department of Defense, to be expended on the approval or authority of the Secretary of Defense and such expenses may be accounted for solely on his certificate that the expenditures were necessary for confidential military purposes, \$75,000,000: *Provided*, That a report of disbursements under this item of appropriation shall be made quarterly to the Appropriation Committees of the Congress.

EMERGENCY FUND

For transfer by the Secretary of Defense, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, to any appropriation for military functions under the Department of Defense available for research and development, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes, and for the same time period, as the appropriation to which transferred, \$90,000,000.

EXPANSION OF UNITED STATES AIR POWER

For the purpose of providing continuous expansion of United States air power by providing additional construction of aircraft and related procurement, Department of the Navy, \$333,000,000; and by providing additional aircraft and related procurement, Department of the Air Force, \$667,000,000.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

TITLE III

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF THE ARMY

CONTINGENCIES OF THE ARMY

For emergencies and military expenses arising in the Department of the Army or any of its subordinate bureaus or offices in the District of Columbia, or in the Army at large, but impossible to be anticipated or classified, including personal services; the actual and necessary expenses or per diem in lieu thereof, as may be determined and approved by the Secretary of the Army, of military and civilian personnel in and under the Department of the Army on special duty in foreign countries; to be expended on the approval or authority of the Secretary of the Army, and for such purposes as he may deem proper, and his determination thereon shall be final and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the Government and payments from this appropriation may, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Army, be made on his certificate that the expenditures were necessary for confidential military purposes; \$88,000,000.

Special duty in foreign countries.

CIVILIAN RELIEF IN KOREA

For an additional amount for "Civilian relief in Korea," \$50,000,000.

EXPEDITING PRODUCTION

To enable the Secretary of the Army, without reference to section 3734 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and to section 1136 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (except provisions thereof relating to title approval), to expedite the production of equipment and supplies for the Army for emergency national defense purposes, including all of the objects and purposes specified under each of the appropriations available to the Department of the Army during the current fiscal year, for procurement or production of equipment or supplies, for erection of structures, or for acquisition of land; the furnishing of Government-owned facilities at privately owned plants; the procurement and training of civilian personnel in connection with the production of equipment and material and the use and operation thereof, \$1,000,000,000.

40 U.S.C.
§§ 259, 267;
10 U.S.C. § 1339.

NATIONAL BOARD FOR PROMOTION OF RIFLE PRACTICE, ARMY

For necessary expenses of construction, equipment, and maintenance of rifle ranges, the instruction of citizens in marksmanship, and promotion of rifle practice, in accordance with the Act of August 29, 1916 (39 Stat. 643), and the provisions of law contained in 10 U. S. C. 1184-1185 and 32 U. S. C. 181-186, including travel of rifle teams, military personnel and individuals attending regional, national, and international competitions, and not to exceed \$18,000 for incidental

Travel expenses. expenses of the National Board, \$130,000: *Provided*, That travel expenses of civilian members of the National Board shall be paid in accordance with the Standardized Government Travel Regulations, as amended.

GENERAL STAFF

FIELD EXERCISES

Participation by National Guard, etc. For expenses, not otherwise provided for, required for the conduct of special field exercises, including participation therein by the National Guard and the Organized Reserves, and including personal services of temporary employees, expenses of troop movements and temporary duty travel of military and civilian personnel, in connection with special field exercises, including special combat training for small units, movement of matériel, maintenance and operation of structures and utilities, rental of land or purchase of options to rent land without reference to section 3648, Revised Statutes, and for use or repair of private property, \$16,000,000.

Rental of land. 31 U.S.C. § 529.

INTER-AMERICAN RELATIONS, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary of the Army to adopt such measures, appropriate to the functions and activities of the Department of the Army, as he may deem advisable, to promote better relations with the other American countries, including transportation and subsistence expenses, while traveling in the Western Hemisphere, of Army officers and military students of the other American countries and Army officers of the United States, \$388,000.

FINANCE CORPS

FINANCE SERVICE, ARMY

For Finance Service, Army, to be accounted for as one fund, as follows—

PAY OF THE ARMY

58 Stat. 8. For pay and allowances (except commuted rations for enlisted personnel) of cadets and all other personnel of the Army of the United States on active duty (other than personnel of the Reserve components, including the National Guard, on active duty while undergoing Reserve training); pay of civilian employees at military headquarters; interest on soldiers' deposits; payment of life insurance premiums authorized by law; mustering-out payments, as authorized by the "Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944", as amended (38 U. S. C. 691-691g), to persons who were or may be denied such payments because they were discharged from the Army to enter the United States Military Academy or the United States Naval Academy and subsequently were discharged from either Academy because of physical disability; expenses of military courts, boards and commissions; expenses of apprehension and delivery of deserters, escaped military prisoners, and soldiers absent without leave, including payment of rewards, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Army, not exceeding \$25 in any one case, to civil officers and citizens, costs of confinement of military prisoners in nonmilitary facilities, donations of not to exceed \$25 to each civilian prisoner upon each release from an Army prison and each soldier discharged otherwise than honorably upon each release from confinement under court-martial sentence, and donations of not to exceed \$10, as authorized by law, to each person discharged for fraudulent enlistment;

\$3,297,076,000: *Provided*, That section 212 of the Act of June 30, 1932 (5 U. S. C. 59a), shall not apply to retired military personnel on duty at the United States Soldiers' Home: *Provided further*, That the duties of librarian at the United States Military Academy may be performed by an officer of the Regular Army retired from active service, and detailed on active duty for that purpose: *Provided further*, That until July 1, 1952, further collection by the Comptroller General of the United States or government accountable officers shall not be made on account of payments for accrued leave to enlisted members discharged for the purpose of immediate reenlistment;

47 Stat. 406.

TRAVEL OF THE ARMY

For travel allowances and travel in kind, as authorized by law, for persons traveling in connection with the military activities of the Department of the Army, including rental of camp sites and the local procurement of communication service, fuel, light, water service, and other necessary supplies and services incident to individual or troop movements, including transportation of organizational equipment and impedimenta; and for expenses, not otherwise provided for, incident to the transportation of authorized baggage of military and civilian personnel; \$245,000,000: *Provided*, That other appropriations for the Department of the Army shall be charged with such amounts as may be required for travel in connection with development, procurement, production, maintenance, or construction activities; and, with such exception, no other Army appropriation in this Act shall be available for any expense for or incident to travel of personnel of the Regular Army or civilian employees under the Department of the Army, except the appropriation "Contingencies of the Army" and the appropriations for Engineer Service, Army, the Army National Guard, the Organized Reserves, the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice, and the appropriations "Special Field Exercises", and "Inter-American Relations, Department of the Army";

Travel charges against other appropriations.

FINANCE SERVICE

For compensation of field personnel of the Finance Corps, and services incident to financial management activities not otherwise provided for; payment of exchange fees and exchange losses incurred by disbursing officers or their agents; and losses in the accounts of Army disbursing officers in accordance with the Acts of December 13, 1944 (31 U. S. C. 95a), December 23, 1944 (50 U. S. C. 1705-1707), and July 26, 1947 (61 Stat. 493); \$48,423,000.

58 Stat. 800, 921.
50 U.S.C. app. §§ 1705-1707.

QUARTERMASTER CORPS

QUARTERMASTER SERVICE, ARMY

For Quartermaster Service, Army, to be accounted for as one fund, as follows—

WELFARE OF ENLISTED MEN

For the equipment and conduct of school, reading, lunch, and amusement rooms, service clubs, chapels, gymnasiums, and libraries, including periodicals and other publications and subscriptions for newspapers, transportation of books and equipment for these services, rental of films, purchase of slides for and making repairs to moving-picture outfits, and for similar and other recreational purposes at training and mobilization camps now established or which may be

Recreational facilities, etc.

All 65 Stat. 428.

Instruction of
officers.

hereafter established, including expenses for the entertainment and instruction of enlisted personnel, \$20,000,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for the instruction of officers on the same basis as enlisted men.

SUBSISTENCE OF THE ARMY

Army vessels.

Sales to offi-
cers, etc.

Allowances.

Prizes.

Payment of sub-
sidies.

Procurement of
food or cloth-
ing not pro-
duced in U.S.

For purchase of subsistence supplies for issue as rations to troops, including retired enlisted men when ordered to active duty, civil employees when entitled thereto, hospital matrons, applicants for enlistment while held under observation, general prisoners of war, and general prisoners at posts; ice for issue to organizations of enlisted men and for cooling drinking water and for preservation of stores; subsistence of the masters, officers, crews, and employees of Army vessels; meals for recruiting parties and applicants for enlistment while under observation; sales to officers, including members of the Officers' Reserve Corps while on active duty, and enlisted men of the Army; payment of allowances of commutation in lieu of rations to enlisted men as authorized by law; commuted rations for enlisted men, applicants for enlistment while held under observation, civilian employees who are entitled to subsistence at public expense, and general prisoners while sick in hospitals, to be paid to the surgeon in charge; advertising; for subsistence of supernumeraries necessitated by emergent military circumstances; prizes to be established by the Secretary of the Army for enlisted men of the Army who graduate from the Army schools for bakers and cooks; and for other necessary expenses incident to the purchase, testing, care, preservation, issue, sale, and accounting for subsistence supplies for the Army; in all, \$603,309,000: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated in this title shall be used for the payment of any subsidy on agricultural or other products: *Provided further*, That no part of this or any other appropriation contained in this Act shall be available for the procurement of any article of food or clothing not grown or produced in the United States or its possessions, except to the extent that the Secretary of the Department concerned shall determine that a satisfactory quality and sufficient quantity of any articles of food or clothing grown or produced in the United States or its possessions cannot be procured as and when needed at United States market prices and except procurements by vessels in foreign waters and emergency procurements or procurements of perishable foods by establishments located outside the continental United States, except the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska, for the personnel attached thereto: *Provided further*, That nothing herein shall preclude the procurement of foods manufactured or processed in the United States or its possessions;

REGULAR SUPPLIES OF THE ARMY

For supplies, services, and other expenses, not otherwise provided for, incident to the design, development, procurement, manufacture, care, protection, alteration, repair, maintenance, installation, storage and issue of Quartermaster Corps supplies, materials, and equipment (exclusive of fixed installations in buildings otherwise provided for), including petroleum and other products, market reports and personal services; supplies and equipment for troops and general service schools; operation of field printing plants not otherwise provided for and contract printing and binding; purchase, subsistence, and care of animals required in connection with Army training and other activities; expenses incident to raising and harvesting forage on military reservations, including, when specifically authorized by the Secretary of the Army, the cost of irrigation; \$465,000,000;

CLOTHING AND EQUIPAGE

For cloth, woolens, materials, and for the purchase and manufacture of clothing for the Army, including retired enlisted men when ordered to active duty, for issue and for sale; commutation of clothing due enlisted men; altering and fitting clothing and washing and cleaning when necessary, including laundry work for enlisted men while patients in a hospital; operation of laundries, existing or now under construction, including purchase and repair of laundry machinery therefor; authorized issues of articles for use of general prisoners confined at military posts without pay or allowances, and for applicants for enlistment while held under observation; equipment and repair of equipment of existing dry-cleaning plants, salvage and sorting storehouses, hat-repairing shops, shoe-repair shops, clothing-repair shops, and garbage-reduction works; equipage; issue of toilet kits to recruits upon their first enlistment; expenses of packing and handling and similar necessities; citizens' outer clothing and an overcoat, when necessary, the cost of all not to exceed \$30, to be issued each person upon each release from an Army prison, each soldier discharged otherwise than honorably, to each enlisted man convicted by civil court for an offense resulting in confinement in a penitentiary or other civil prison, and to each enlisted man ordered interned as an alien enemy, or, for the same reason, discharged without internment; \$1,506,681,000: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated in this Act, and none of the property procured therewith, shall be available for transfer to any working capital fund under clothing and equipage in the Department of the Army under section 405 (d) of the National Security Act, as amended.

63 Stat. 588.
5 U.S.C. § 172d.

INCIDENTAL EXPENSES OF THE ARMY

Postage; incidental expenses of recruiting; for activities of chaplains (excluding ritual garments and personal services); for tests and experimental and development work and scientific research, not otherwise provided for, including that to be performed by the Bureau of Standards for the Quartermaster Corps; for inspection service and instruction furnished by the Department of Agriculture which may be transferred in advance; for such additional expenditures as are necessary and authorized by law in the movements and operation of the Army and at military posts, and not expressly assigned to any other departments; for burial of the dead as authorized by Acts of May 17, 1938 (10 U. S. C. 916-916d), and July 8, 1940 (5 U. S. C. 103a), including remains of personnel of the Army of the United States who die while on active duty, including travel allowances of attendants accompanying remains, communication service, transportation of remains, and acquisition by lease or otherwise of temporary burial sites; \$193,000,000: *Provided*, That expenditures of appropriations contained in this Act for public informational activities of the Department of Defense shall not exceed \$10,950,000 including pay and allowances of military personnel assigned to such activities: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated in this Act shall be used for expenditure in connection with recruitment advertising including sponsorship of radio and television shows by the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, or the Department of the Air Force.

Recruiting.
Tests, research,
etc.

Burial expenses.
52 Stat. 398.
54 Stat. 743.

Recruitment
advertising.

TRANSPORTATION CORPS

TRANSPORTATION SERVICE, ARMY

For expenses necessary for the transportation of Army supplies, equipment, funds of the Army, including packing, crating, and unpacking; maintenance and operation of transportation facilities and installations, including the purchase, construction, alteration, operation, lease, repair, development, and maintenance of and research in transportation equipment, including boats, vessels, and railroad equipment; procurement of supplies and equipment; communication service; maps, wharfage, tolls, ferriage, drayage, and cartage; conducting instruction in Army transportation activities; \$968,515,000: *Provided*, That during the current fiscal year the cost of transportation from point of origin to the first point of storage or consumption of supplies, equipment, and material in connection with the manufacturing and purchasing activities of the Quartermaster Corps may be charged to the appropriations from which such supplies, equipment, and material are procured: *Provided further*, That vessels under the jurisdiction of the Department of Commerce, the Department of the Army, the Department of the Air Force, or the Department of the Navy may be transferred or otherwise made available without reimbursement to any of such agencies upon the request of the head of one agency and the approval of the agency having jurisdiction of the vessels concerned.

SIGNAL CORPS

SIGNAL SERVICE OF THE ARMY

Purchase, equipment, operation, installation, and repair of military telegraph, telephone, radio, cable, signaling, and aircraft warning systems; signal equipment and stores, heliographs, signal lanterns, flags, and other necessary instruments; wind vanes, barometers, anemometers, thermometers, and other meteorological instruments; photographic and cinematographic work performed for the Army by the Signal Corps; motor-driven and other vehicles for technical and official purposes in connection with the construction, operation, and maintenance of communication or signaling systems, and supplies for their operation and maintenance; maps for use of the Signal Corps and in the office of the Chief Signal Officer; telephone apparatus, including rental and payment for commercial, exchange, message, trunk-line, long-distance, and leased-line telephone service, excepting telephone service for the various bureaus in the District of Columbia, and the rental of commercial telegraph lines and equipment, and their operation, at or connecting any Army facility, including payment for official individual telegraph messages transmitted over commercial lines; electrical installations and maintenance thereof, electric time service, fire control and direction apparatus, and matériel for Field Artillery; supplies, general repairs, reserve supplies, and other expenses connected with the collection and transmitting of information for the Army by telegraph or otherwise; experimental investigation, research, purchase, and development, or improvements in apparatus, and maintenance of signaling and accessories thereto, including machines, instruments, and other equipment for laboratory and repair purposes; lease, alteration, and repair of such buildings required for storing or guarding Signal Corps supplies, equipment, and personnel when not otherwise provided for, including the introduction of water, electric light and power, sewerage, grading, roads and walks, and other equipment required; for all expenses, not otherwise provided for, incident to the preparation of plans, and construction, purchase,

Charges against other appropriations.

Transfer of vessels.

Telegraph systems, etc.

Vehicles.

Telephone apparatus.

Telegraph lines.

Electrical installations.

Experimental investigation, etc.

Aircraft warning service systems.

installation, equipment, maintenance, repair, and operation of aircraft warning service systems, and their accessories, including purchase of lands and rights-of-way, acquisition of leaseholds and other interests therein, and temporary use thereof; \$1,213,707,000.

ALASKA COMMUNICATION SYSTEM

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

For expenses necessary for the operation, maintenance, and improvement of the Alaska Communication System, including purchase (not to exceed one) and hire of passenger motor vehicles, \$4,176,000, to remain available until the close of the fiscal year 1953, and in addition not to exceed 15 per centum of the current fiscal year receipts of the Alaska Communication System may be merged with and used for the purposes of this appropriation.

CONSTRUCTION

For construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, including buildings, facilities, appurtenances and utilities, at stations of the Alaska Communication System, as authorized by Act of October 27, 1949 (Public Law 414), without regard to sections 1136 and 3734, Revised Statutes, as amended, including hire of passenger motor vehicles; \$1,400,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be available for construction of family quarters at (1) an average cost in excess of \$24,000 for construction, including but not limited to, kitchen range, refrigerator, telephone, architectural and engineering services, and all contingencies; nor at (2) a cost per family unit in excess of \$5,000, for site development and outside utilities, including architectural and engineering services therefor and all contingencies.

63 Stat. 934.
10 U.S.C. § 1339;
40 U.S.C. §§ 259,
267.

MEDICAL SERVICE

MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL DEPARTMENT

For the manufacture and purchase of medical and hospital supplies for military posts, camps, hospitals, hospital ships and transports, and supplies required for mosquito destruction in and about military posts in the Canal Zone; operation of the Army Medical Library and Museum under the direct supervision of the Surgeon General; purchase of veterinary supplies and hire of veterinary surgeons; expenses of medical supply depots and maintenance of branch depots; medical care and treatment of patients when entitled thereto by law, regulation, or contract, including their care, treatment, and subsistence in private hospitals, whether on duty or on furlough or on leave of absence except when elective medical treatment has been obtained by such personnel in civilian hospitals or from civilian physicians or dentists; medical care and treatment of authorized personnel of any country whose defense the President deems vital to the defense of the United States when such care and treatment cannot be obtained from medical units of their own country; care and treatment of epidemic and contagious diseases in the Army or at military posts or stations, including measures to prevent the spread thereof; pay of internes; pay of civilian physicians employed to examine physically applicants for enlistment and enlisted men and to render other professional services from time to time under proper authority; payment of express companies and local transfers employed directly by the Medical Service for the transportation of

Care and treatment of patients.

Epidemic and contagious diseases.

Internes; civilian physicians.

Army and Navy
Hospital,
Hot Springs,
Ark.

medical and hospital supplies, including bidders' samples and water for analysis; supply of Army and Navy Hospital at Hot Springs, Arkansas; advertising, and other necessary miscellaneous expenses of the Medical Service, including tuition and fees of military and civilian personnel at civilian educational institutions; \$269,580,000.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS

ENGINEER SERVICE, ARMY

Equipment, etc.

Engineer
School.

62 Stat. 277.

32 Stat. 282.

For expenses necessary for the procurement, manufacture, maintenance, and issue of utilities, engineer supplies, materials, and equipment; procurement, preparation, and reproduction of maps and similar data for military purposes; military surveys, engineering planning, and investigation and design; expenses incident to military and training operations, including operation of the Engineer School; travel and transportation; rentals, at the seat of Government or elsewhere, maintenance, installation, alteration, repair, protection, and operation of buildings, grounds, and other facilities, including appurtenances thereto; administration of real estate, acquisition of lands, easements, rights-of-way, or other similar interests in and temporary use of lands, and, in administering the provisions of 43 U. S. C. 315q, rentals may be paid in advance; payment of deficiency judgments and interest thereon arising out of condemnation proceedings; relocation of utilities not otherwise provided for; utility services for buildings erected at private cost, as authorized by law (10 U. S. C. 1346), and buildings on military reservations authorized by Department of the Army regulations to be used for a similar purpose; and expenses of packing, crating, unpacking, and uncrating of supplies, materials, equipment, and baggage not otherwise provided for; \$1,166,049,000.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY

For an additional amount for "Military construction, Army," to remain available until expended. \$48,363,700, for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority heretofore granted under this head to enter into contracts.

ORDNANCE CORPS

ORDNANCE SERVICE AND SUPPLIES, ARMY

Instruction,
etc.

Publications.
65 Stat. 432.
65 Stat. 433.

For manufacture, procurement, storage, and issue, including research, planning, design, development, inspection, test, alteration, maintenance, repair, and handling of ordnance material and aircraft, together with the machinery, supplies, and services necessary thereto; supplies and services in connection with the general work of the Ordnance Corps, comprising police and office duties, rents, tolls, fuel, light, water, advertising, stationery, typewriting and computing machines, including their exchange, and furniture, tools, and instruments of service; instruction, training, and other incidental expenses of the ordnance service; purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles; ammunition for military salutes at Government establishments and institutions to which the issues of arms for salutes are authorized; services, material, tools, and appliances for operation of the testing machines and chemical laboratory in connection therewith; publications for libraries of the Ordnance Corps, including the Ordnance Office; \$8,076,056,430.

CHEMICAL CORPS

CHEMICAL SERVICE, ARMY

For purchase, manufacture, and test of chemical agents and toxic substances, incendiary materials and munitions, gas masks, or other offensive or defensive materials or appliances required for chemical purposes, investigations, research, design, experimentation, and operation, purchase of chemicals, special scientific and technical apparatus and instruments, including services connected therewith; maintenance and repair of plants, buildings, and equipment, and the machinery therefor; receiving, storing, and issuing of supplies, comprising police and office duties, rents, tolls, fuels, gasoline, lubricants, paints and oils, rope and cordage, light, water, advertising, stationery, typewriting and computing machines including their exchange, office furniture, tools, and instruments; incidental expenses; libraries of the Chemical Corps; expenses incidental to the organization, training, and equipment of special gas troops not otherwise provided for, including the training of the Army in Chemical Corps activities, both offensive and defensive, together with the necessary schools, tactical demonstrations, and maneuvers; expenses of chemical projectile filling plants and proving grounds, including maintenance of rail transportation, repairs, alterations, accessories, building and repairing butts and targets, clearing and grading ranges; \$122,560,000.

Chemical agents, etc.

Plant maintenance, etc.

Special gas troops.

Chemical Corps activities.

ARMY TRAINING

For miscellaneous supplies, material, equipment, and services, tuition and other incidental expenses, not otherwise provided for, essential in conducting instruction in service schools and elsewhere; contingencies for the Commandant of the National War College, to be expended in his discretion (not exceeding \$1,000); purchase, repair, and cleaning of uniforms for guards at the National War College; operation of the Office, Chief, Army Field Forces, subordinate commands, installations, and boards, not otherwise provided for, \$22,300,000.

Instruction in service schools.

National War College.

UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION

For text and reference books for instruction; increase and expense of library; office equipment and supplies; stationery, blank books, forms, diplomas for graduates; expense of lectures; apparatus, equipment, supplies, and materials for purpose of instruction and athletics, and maintenance and repair thereof; musical instruments and maintenance of band; care and maintenance of organ; equipment for cadet mess; postage, telephones, and telegrams; freight and expressage; for commutation of rations to the cadet mess for civilians employed and subsisted at cadet mess in the same amount as deducted from each civilian's pay for said rations; expenses, including not to exceed \$95,000 for contingencies, incident to the observance of the Sesquicentennial of the Military Academy; contingencies for Superintendent of the Military Academy (not exceeding \$5,200) and for the Com-

Sesquicentennial expenses.

Contingent funds.

mandant of Cadets (not exceeding \$1,200), to be expended in their respective discretions; expenses of the members of the Board of Visitors (not exceeding \$1,500); contingent fund, to be expended under the direction of the Academic Board (not exceeding \$1,000); improvement, repair, and maintenance of buildings and grounds (including roads, walls, and fences); shooting galleries and ranges; cooking, heating, and lighting apparatus and fixtures and operation and maintenance thereof; maintenance of water, sewer, and plumbing systems; maintenance of and repairs to cadet camp; fire-extinguishing apparatus; machinery and tools and repairs of same; policing buildings and grounds; furniture, refrigerators, and lockers for Government-owned buildings at the Academy and repair and maintenance thereof; fuel for heat, light, and power; and other necessary incidental expenses in the discretion of the superintendent; in all, \$6,305,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$3,750 of this amount shall be available to liquidate the indebtedness of cadets separated from the service for any reason during their first year, who at the time of their separation are in debt to the Treasurer of the United States Military Academy.

Liquidation of indebtedness of certain cadets.

CIVILIAN COMPONENTS

ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

Training, etc. For expenses necessary for equipping, maintaining, operating and training the Army National Guard, including expenses of camps, airfields, storage facilities, buildings, structures, rifle ranges, and facilities, the purchase (not to exceed one hundred) and hire of passenger motor vehicles for official use only, and the modification, repair, maintenance and operation of airplanes; transportation of things; personal services in the National Guard Bureau and services of personnel of the Army National Guard employed as civilians (without regard to their military rank) necessary for the care, maintenance, modification and repair of materials and equipment, for Federal property and custodial accounting work, and for administrative and such other duties as may be required; medical and hospital treatment of members of the Army National Guard who suffer injury or contract disease in line of duty and other expenses connected therewith as authorized by law; pay at a rate not less than \$2,400 per annum and travel of property and disbursing officers for the United States; travel expenses (other than mileage), at the same rates as authorized by law for Army National Guard personnel on active Federal duty, of Army National Guard division and regimental commanders while inspecting units in compliance with National Guard regulations when specifically authorized by the Chief, National Guard Bureau; attendance of Army National Guard personnel at military service schools; drill pay of the Army National Guard; subsistence for drills of eight or more hours duration in any one calendar day; expenses of temporary duty travel of personnel of the Regular Army in connection with activities of the Army National Guard; procurement and issue to the Army National Guard of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia of military equipment and supplies, as provided by law, including motor-propelled vehicles and airplanes; and expenses of repair, modification, issue, maintenance and use of supplies, mate-

Medical treatment, etc.

Travel expenses.

Attendance at military service schools.

rial and equipment, and such property may be furnished from Army stocks without reimbursement subject to recall for Army requirements; \$202,982,000, to remain available until June 30, 1953: *Provided*, That the number of caretakers authorized to be employed for any one unit or pool under the provisions of section 90 of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, as amended, may be such as is deemed necessary by the Secretary of the Army.

65 Stat. 434.

65 Stat. 435.

Caretakers.

39 Stat. 205.

32 U.S.C. § 42.

ORGANIZED RESERVES

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, and transportation (including mileage, actual and necessary expenses, or per diem in lieu thereof), and medical and hospital treatment and related expenses, as authorized by law, for personnel of the Organized Reserve Corps while on active duty undergoing Reserve training or while performing drills or equivalent duty; maintenance, operation, rental, repair, and other necessary expenses of facilities for the training and administration of the Organized Reserve Corps; expenses of temporary-duty travel in connection with activities of the Organized Reserve Corps; transportation of things; purchase (not to exceed two hundred) and hire of passenger motor vehicles and aircraft; supplies, services, matériel, and equipment, not otherwise provided for, necessary to train and equip the Organized Reserve Corps; and expenses of modification, issue, maintenance, and use of supplies, matériel, and equipment, which may be furnished without reimbursement from Army stocks; \$104,810,000 to remain available until June 30, 1953.

ARMY RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS

For expenses necessary for the operation of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, as authorized by law, including procurement, maintenance, transportation, and issue of supplies and equipment; pay, subsistence, allowances, transportation (including mileage), and medical and hospital treatment and related expenses for members of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps as authorized by law; hire of passenger motor vehicles; maintenance and operation of facilities; establishment and maintenance of camps; cleaning and laundrying of uniforms and clothing at camps; expenses of temporary duty travel in connection with activities of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps; expenses for institutions as authorized by section 1225, Revised Statutes, as amended, and section 55c of the National Defense Act, as amended (34 U. S. C. 1129; 10 U. S. C. 1180, 1181); expenses of modification, issue, maintenance, and use of supplies, materials, and equipment, which may be furnished without reimbursement from Army stocks; to remain available until June 30, 1953, \$27,141,000.

Supplies, etc.

41 Stat. 780.

10 U.S.C. § 1182a.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY CIVILIAN COMPONENTS

For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation and conversion of facilities for the training and administration of the reserve components, including contributions therefor, as authorized by the Act of September 11, 1950 (64 Stat. 829), without regard to sections 1136 and 3734, Revised Statutes, as amended, and land and interests therein may be acquired and construction prosecuted thereon prior to the approval of title by the Attorney General as required by section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; hire of passenger motor vehicles; \$24,000,000, to remain available until expended.

50 U.S.C. § 881
note.

10 U.S.C. § 1339;

40 U.S.C. §§ 259,
267.

33 U.S.C. § 733
and note.

DEPARTMENTAL SALARIES AND EXPENSES

SALARIES, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

For compensation for personal services in the Department of the Army proper, to be accounted for as one fund, as follows:

Office of Secretary of the Army: Secretary of the Army, Under Secretary of the Army, Assistant Secretaries of the Army, and other personal services, \$3,723,400.

Office of Chief of Staff, \$9,500,000;

Adjutant General's Office, \$16,500,000;

Office of the Inspector General, \$259,000;

Office of the Judge Advocate General, \$743,000;

Office of the Chief of Finance, \$1,540,500;

Office of the Quartermaster General, \$9,875,000;

Office of the Chief of Transportation, \$4,024,000;

Office of the Chief Signal Officer, \$3,750,000;

Office of the Provost Marshal General, \$245,000;

Office of the Surgeon General, \$3,100,000;

Office of Chief of Engineers, \$5,400,000;

Office of Chief of Ordnance, \$6,750,000;

Office of Chief, Chemical Corps, \$1,500,000;

Office of Chief of Chaplains, \$170,000.

Total expenditures of funds appropriated by this paragraph shall be limited to 95 per centum of the total amount appropriated by this paragraph.

CONTINGENT EXPENSES, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

For miscellaneous expenses at the seat of government, \$30,000,000.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

TITLE IV

MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY

For pay, allowances, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, clothing, permanent change of station travel (including expenses of temporary duty between permanent duty stations), and transportation of dependents, as authorized by law, for regular and reserve personnel on active duty (except those on active duty while undergoing reserve training), \$2,456,475,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVAL RESERVE

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, and travel, as authorized by law, for personnel of the Naval Reserve on active duty while undergoing reserve training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty, \$62,718,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, OFFICER CANDIDATES

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, and travel, as authorized by law, for officer candidates, including midshipmen at the Naval Academy, aviation midshipmen, aviation cadets, regular and contract enrollees in the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and Reserve officer candidates; and retainer pay authorized by the Act of August 13, 1946 (34 U. S. C. 1020h), to remain available until June 30, 1953; \$19,348,000.

NAVY PERSONNEL, GENERAL EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for general training, education and administration of regular and reserve personnel, including tuition, cash book allowances of not to exceed \$50 for each Naval Aviation College program student, and other costs incurred at civilian schools, general training aids and devices, procurement of military personnel, and authorized annuity premiums and retirement benefits for civilian members of teaching staffs; maintenance and operation of Navy training and personnel facilities, including the Naval Academy, Naval Postgraduate School, Naval War College, Naval Home, Navy training schools and facilities, disciplinary barracks, and retraining commands; rent; hire of motor vehicles; not to exceed \$30 per person for civilian clothing, including an overcoat when necessary, for enlisted personnel discharged otherwise than honorably; welfare and recreation; medals and other awards; research and development; and departmental salaries; \$97,570,000.

Naval Aviation
College program
students.

Navy training.

Welfare, etc.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For pay, allowances, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, clothing, permanent change of station travel (including expenses of temporary duty between permanent duty stations), and transportation of dependents, as authorized by law, for regular and reserve personnel on active duty (except those on active duty while undergoing reserve training), \$565,459,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS RESERVE

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, and travel, as authorized by law, for personnel of the Marine Corps Reserve and the Marine Corps platoon leaders class on active duty while undergoing reserve training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty, \$15,145,000.

MARINE CORPS TROOPS AND FACILITIES

For necessary expenses of troops and facilities of the Marine Corps not otherwise provided for, including maintenance and operation of equipment and facilities, and procurement of military personnel; training and education of regular and reserve personnel, including tuition and other costs incurred at civilian schools; welfare and recreation; not to exceed \$30 per person for civilian clothing, including an overcoat when necessary, for enlisted personnel discharged otherwise than honorably; research and development; procurement and manufacture of ordnance, ammunition, and other military supplies, equipment and clothing; purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles; transportation of things; industrial mobilization; rent; medals, awards, emblems and other insignia; care of the dead; and departmental salaries; \$1,018,120,000.

Civilian
schools.

Care of the
dead.

AIRCRAFT AND FACILITIES

For expenses necessary for maintenance, operation, and modification of aircraft; maintenance, operation, and lease of air stations and facilities, testing laboratories, fleet and other aviation activities; procurement of services, supplies, special clothing, tools, materials, and equipment, including rescue boats; research and development; industrial mobilization; aerological services, supplies, and equipment for

Procurement of
supplies, etc.

65 Stat. 438.

Liquidation of
contract obli-
gations.

62 Stat. 590.

the Navy and Marine Corps; and departmental salaries; \$923,393,000: *Provided*, That the unexpended balance of the appropriation for "Aviation, Navy, 1949" shall remain available until June 30, 1952, for the liquidation of contract obligations incurred thereunder during the fiscal year 1949 for aircraft equipment and research and development.

CONSTRUCTION OF AIRCRAFT AND RELATED PROCUREMENT

40 U.S.C.
§§ 259, 267.

33 U.S.C.
§ 733 and note.

Liquidation of
obligations.

For construction, procurement, and modernization of aircraft and equipment, including ordnance, spare parts, and accessories therefor; expansion of public and not to exceed \$100,000,000 for expansion of private plants, including the land necessary therefor, without regard to section 3734, Revised Statutes, as amended, and such land, and interests therein, may be acquired and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title by the Attorney General as required by section 355, Revised Statutes, as amended; procurement and installation of equipment in public or private plants; and departmental salaries necessary for the purposes of this appropriation, to remain available until expended, \$4,000,000,000, of which \$450,000,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred under authority heretofore granted to enter into contracts for the foregoing purposes.

SHIPS AND FACILITIES

Machine tools,
plant appli-
ances, etc.

For expenses necessary for design, maintenance, operation, and alteration of vessels; maintenance and operation of facilities; procurement of plant equipment, appliances, and machine tools, and installation thereof in public or private plants; procurement of equipment, supplies, special clothing and services, including subsistence and other expenses of civilian crews of vessels; installation, maintenance, and removal of ships' ordnance; lease of facilities and docks; charter and hire of vessels; relief of vessels in distress; maritime salvage services; research and development; industrial mobilization; and departmental salaries; \$1,537,452,000.

CONSTRUCTION OF SHIPS

For an additional amount for "Construction of Ships," to remain available until expended, \$77,353,000, of which \$55,961,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority heretofore granted under this head: *Provided*, That the total of obligations incurred under this head for construction, conversion, or replacement, approved after July 17, 1947, shall not exceed \$1,085,663,000.

SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION

For expenses necessary for the construction, acquisition, or conversion of vessels as authorized by the Act of March 10, 1951 (Public Law 3), or otherwise authorized by law, including plant equipment, appliances, and machine tools, and installation thereof in public or private plants, and departmental salaries necessary for the purposes of this appropriation, \$1,343,297,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the amount heretofore appropriated under the head "Construction of ships" for the purposes of the Act of March 10, 1951, is hereby transferred to and merged with this appropriation: *Provided further*, That the total of obligations incurred for the foregoing purposes shall not exceed \$1,480,297,000.

ORDNANCE AND FACILITIES

For expenses necessary for the production and procurement of Navy ordnance and ammunition (except ordnance for new aircraft, new ships, and ships authorized for conversion); alteration, preservation, and handling of ordnance and ammunition; maintenance of ordnance (except installation, maintenance, and removal of ships' ordnance, and line maintenance of ordnance installed in aircraft); maintenance and operation of ordnance facilities; procurement of equipment, supplies, special clothing and services; procurement of plant equipment, appliances, and machine tools, and installation thereof in naval or private plants; lease of facilities; research and development; industrial mobilization; and departmental salaries; \$1,335,668,000.

ORDNANCE FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION

For an additional amount for "Ordnance for new construction," to remain available until expended, \$52,445,000, for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority heretofore granted under this head.

ORDNANCE FOR SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION

For expenses necessary for the construction and procurement of armor and armament for vessels provided for in the appropriation "Shipbuilding and conversion," including plant equipment, appliances, and machine tools, and installation thereof in public or private plants, and departmental salaries necessary for the purposes of this appropriation, \$431,390,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the total of obligations incurred under this head shall not exceed \$431,390,000.

INCREASE AND REPLACEMENT OF NAVAL VESSELS

CONSTRUCTION AND MACHINERY

For an additional amount for "Construction and machinery", including, during the current fiscal year, personal services in the Bureau of Ships necessary for the purposes of this appropriation, \$45,000,000.

ARMOR, ARMAMENT, AND AMMUNITION

For an additional amount for "Armor, armament, and ammunition," including, during the current fiscal year, personal services in the Bureau of Ordnance necessary for the purposes of this appropriation, \$12,656,000.

MEDICAL CARE

For expenses necessary for maintenance and operation of naval hospitals, medical centers, clinics, schools, research facilities, the medical supply system, and other medical activities; procurement of ambulances, medical and dental supplies, equipment and services; rent; instruction of medical personnel in naval hospitals, naval medical schools, and civilian schools; research and development; industrial mobilization; care of the dead; and departmental salaries; \$135,770,000.

CIVIL ENGINEERING

For expenses necessary for maintenance and operation of district public works offices, public works centers, advance base depots, construction battalion centers, defense housing projects, other civil engi-

neering facilities, and shore activities not otherwise provided for; procurement of services, supplies and equipment for the foregoing activities; purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles; research and development; engineering services; industrial mobilization; and departmental salaries; \$196,488,000.

PUBLIC WORKS

For an additional amount for "Public works", to remain available until expended, \$51,657,000, of which \$1,243,000 shall be used for construction, installation, or repair of sewage facilities at the naval base, Newport, Rhode Island, and the remainder shall be available for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority heretofore granted under this head to enter into contracts.

Naval base,
Newport, R.I.

FACILITIES

For expenses necessary for acquisition, construction, and installation of production facilities and equipment, and test facilities and equipment (other than those for research and development), including the land necessary therefor, without regard to section 3734, Revised Statutes, as amended, and such land, and interests therein, may be acquired and construction prosecuted thereon prior to the approval of title by the Attorney General as required by section 355, Revised Statutes, as amended, such amounts as may be determined by the Secretary of the Navy, and approved by the Secretary of Defense and the Bureau of the Budget, and said amounts shall be derived by transfer from any appropriations available to the Department of the Navy, during the fiscal year 1952, for procurement of equipment for installation or use in private plants: *Provided*, That the total amount so transferred shall not exceed \$100,000,000.

40 U.S.C.
§§ 259, 267.

33 U.S.C.
§ 733 and note.

RESEARCH

For conduct and encouragement of research and development, not otherwise provided for; dissemination of scientific information; administration of patents, trade-marks, and copyrights; maintenance and operation of research and development facilities; development, installation, and maintenance of special devices (including specialized housing therefor); procurement of supplies, services, and equipment; departmental salaries; and other expenses necessary in carrying out the Act of August 1, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 475), to remain available until expended, \$69,698,000.

60 Stat. 779.

SERVICE-WIDE SUPPLY AND FINANCE

For expenses necessary for maintenance and operation of service-wide supply and finance activities, including supply depots and centers, clothing depots, market and purchasing offices, supply demand control points, fleet fueling facilities, overseas air cargo terminals, regional accounting and disbursing offices, the material catalog office, the cost inspection service, and other service-wide supply and finance facilities, as designated by the Secretary; procurement of supplies, services, special clothing, and equipment; rent; intra-Navy transportation of things, all transportation of Navy stock fund material, and transportation of household effects; research and development; industrial mobilization; losses in exchange and in the accounts of disbursing officers, as authorized by law; and departmental salaries; \$485,102,000.

Procurement of
supplies.
Intra-Navy
transportation.

NAVY STOCK FUND

For additional working capital for the Navy stock fund, established pursuant to the National Security Act Amendments of 1949, \$450,000,000.

63 Stat. 578.
5 U.S.C. § 171
note.

SERVICE-WIDE OPERATIONS

For expenses necessary for maintenance and operation of the Naval Observatory, the Hydrographic Office, Service-wide Communications, Naval Records Centers, Naval District Headquarters (except training and public works offices), River Commands, and other service-wide operations and functions not otherwise provided for; procurement of supplies, services and equipment for activities financed hereunder; Latin-American cooperation; not to exceed \$42,127,000 for emergencies and extraordinary expenses, as authorized by section 6 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 419c), to be expended on the approval and authority of the Secretary, and his determination shall be final and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the Government; and departmental salaries; \$150,779,000.

Latin-American
cooperation.
60 Stat. 853.

OPERATION AND CONSERVATION OF NAVAL PETROLEUM RESERVES

For expenses necessary for exploration, prospecting, conservation, development, use, and operation of the naval petroleum reserves, as authorized by law, \$11,908,000.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

TITLE V

AIRCRAFT AND RELATED PROCUREMENT

For construction, procurement, and modification of aircraft and equipment, armor and armament, spare parts and accessories therefor; specialized equipment; expansion of public and private plants, Government-owned equipment and installation thereof in such plants, erection of structures, and acquisition of land without regard to section 1136, Revised Statutes, as amended, for the foregoing and other purposes, and such land, and interests therein, may be acquired and construction prosecuted thereon prior to the approval of title by the Attorney General as required by section 355, Revised Statutes, as amended; industrial mobilization, including maintenance of reserve plants and equipment and procurement planning; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, including rents and transportation of things; to remain available until expended; \$11,215,800,000, of which \$625,000,000 is for payment of obligations incurred under authority heretofore granted to enter into contracts for the foregoing purposes: *Provided*, That the unexpended balances of the appropriations granted under the head "Air Corps, Army," 1948, and "General expenses, U. S. Air Force," 1949, shall remain available until June 30, 1952, for the payment of obligations incurred thereunder prior to July 1, 1948, and July 1, 1949, respectively.

10 U.S.C. § 1339.

33 U.S.C. § 733
and note.

Payment of
obligations.

61 Stat. 559.
62 Stat. 648.

MAJOR PROCUREMENT OTHER THAN AIRCRAFT

For procurement of supplies, materials, and equipment, and spare parts therefor, not otherwise provided for; electronic and communication equipment; and the purchase of passenger motor vehicles, \$1,775,000,000, to remain available until expended.

ACQUISITION AND CONSTRUCTION OF REAL PROPERTY

64 Stat. 1221.
5 U.S.C. § 171x. For the continuation of the construction of four projects authorized by Public Law 910, Eighty-first Congress, approved January 6, 1951, and Public Law 43, Eighty-second Congress, approved May 31, 1951, to remain available until expended, \$187,300,000, of which \$85,000,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority heretofore granted under this heading to enter into contracts.

MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION

56 Stat. 654.
Training and instruction.
32 Stat. 282.
Rental of land, etc.
31 U.S.C. § 529.
Exchange fees and losses.
58 Stat. 800,
921; 61 Stat.
493; 52 Stat.
398; 54 Stat.
743.
50 U.S.C. app.
§§ 1705-1709;
31 U.S.C. 95a
note.
60 Stat. 858.

For expenses necessary for the maintenance, operation, and administration of the activities of the Air Force, including the United States Air Force Reserve and the Air Reserve Officers' Training Corps; maintenance, operation, and modification of aircraft; transportation of things; rents at the seat of government and elsewhere, and in administering the provisions of 43 U. S. C. 315q payments of rents may be made in advance; repair of facilities; field printing plants; procurement of ambulances; hire of passenger motor vehicles; training and instruction of military and civilian personnel of the Air Force, including tuition and related expenses; pay, allowances and travel expenses of contract surgeons; utility services for buildings erected at private cost as authorized by law (10 U. S. C. 1346), and buildings on military reservations authorized by Air Force regulations to be used for welfare and recreational purposes; rental of land or purchase of options to rent land without reference to section 3648, Revised Statutes, as amended, use or repair of private property, and other necessary expenses of combat maneuvers; organizational clothing and equipage; payment of exchange fees and exchange losses incurred by Air Force disbursing officers or their agents; losses in the accounts of Air Force disbursing officers as authorized by law (31 U. S. C. 95a; 50 U. S. C. 1705-1707; Act of July 26, 1947, Public Law 248); burial of the dead as authorized by law (10 U. S. C. 916-916d; 5 U. S. C. 103a), including remains of personnel of the Air Force of the United States who die while on active duty, travel allowances of attendants accompanying remains, and acquisition by lease or otherwise of temporary burial sites; conduct of schoolrooms, service clubs, chapels, and other instructional, entertainment, and welfare expenses for enlisted men, not otherwise provided for; expenses for inter-American cooperation as authorized for the Navy by the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 421f), for Latin-American cooperation; payments of deficiency judgments and interests thereon arising out of condemnation proceedings heretofore instituted; and special services by contract or otherwise; \$3,208,442,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS

Expenses of individual or troop movements.

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, transportation, interest on deposits of enlisted personnel, and travel in kind for cadets and all other personnel of the Air Force of the United States on active duty (other than personnel of the Reserve components, including the Air National Guard, on active duty while undergoing reserve training), including commutation of quarters, subsistence supplies for issue as rations to enlisted personnel, cloth and materials and clothing for issue and sale, and clothing allowances, as authorized by law; and, in connection with personnel paid from this appropriation, for rental of camp sites and local procurement of utility services and other necessary expenses incident to individual or troop movements (including packing and unpacking and transportation of organizational equipment), ice, meals for recruiting parties, monetary allowances for liquid

offee for troops when supplied cooked or travel rations, altering and fitting clothing, and commutation of rations, as authorized by law, of enlisted personnel, including those sick in hospitals (to be paid to the surgeon in charge); transportation, as authorized by law, of dependents, baggage, and household effects of personnel paid from his appropriation; rations for civilian employees when entitled hereto, applicants for enlistment, prisoners of war, and general prisoners; subsistence supplies for resale, as authorized by law; commutation of rations, as authorized by regulations, to applicants for enlistment, civilian employees entitled to subsistence at public expense, and general prisoners, while sick in hospitals (to be paid to the surgeon in charge); subsistence of supernumeraries necessitated by emergent military circumstances; issues of toilet articles and barbers' and tailors' material to general prisoners confined at military posts without pay and allowances, applicants for enlistment, and recruits upon first enlistment; civilian clothing and when necessary an overcoat, the cost of all not to exceed \$30, for each person upon each release from a military prison, each enlisted man discharged otherwise than honorably, each enlisted man convicted by a civil court for an offense resulting in confinement in a civil prison, and each enlisted man interned, or discharged without internment as an alien enemy; expenses of apprehension and delivery of deserters, stragglers, and escaped military prisoners; payment, in the discretion of the Secretary, of rewards (not to exceed \$25 in any one case) for the apprehension of deserters; confinement of military prisoners in nonmilitary facilities; donations of not to exceed \$25 to each civilian prisoner upon each release from a military prison, to each enlisted man discharged otherwise than honorably upon each release from confinement under court-martial sentence, and to each person discharged for fraudulent enlistment; expenses of courts, boards, and commissions; welfare; and medals and other awards; \$3,016,700,000.

Transportation of dependents, etc.
Rations for civilian employees.

Rewards.

Donations to designated released prisoners.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

For expenses necessary for basic and applied scientific research and development, by contract or otherwise, and transportation of things, to remain available until expended, \$425,000,000.

RESERVE PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, and travel for personnel of the United States Air Force Reserve and the Air Reserve Officers' Training Corps, while on active duty undergoing reserve training or while performing drills or equivalent duty, or undergoing training and instruction or on duty under section 5, National Defense Act, as authorized by law; and the procurement and issue of uniforms to institutions necessary for the training of the Air Reserve Officers' Training Corps, as authorized by law, \$19,043,000, to remain available until June 30, 1953.

39 Stat. 167.
10 U.S.C. § 38.

AIR NATIONAL GUARD

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, transportation (including mileage, actual and necessary expenses, or per diem in lieu thereof), medical and hospital treatment and related expenses, for members of the Air National Guard while undergoing Reserve training or while performing drills or equivalent duty, including officers on duty under section 5, National Defense Act, as authorized by law; travel expenses (other than mileage), on the same basis as authorized by law for Air National Guard personnel on active Federal duty, of

39 Stat. 167.
10 U.S.C. § 38.

<p>Training, etc.</p> <p>64 Stat. 829. 50 U.S.C. § 881 note. Supplies, etc.</p> <p>Caretakers.</p> <p>39 Stat. 205.</p>	<p>Air National Guard commanders while inspecting units in compliance with National Guard regulations when specifically authorized by the Chief, National Guard Bureau; establishment, maintenance, operation, repair, and other necessary expenses of facilities for the training and administration of the Air National Guard, including construction of facilities, and additions, extensions, alterations, improvements, and rehabilitation of existing facilities, as authorized by the Act of September 11, 1950 (Public Law 783); maintenance, operation, and modification of aircraft; transportation of things; purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles; procurement and issue to the Air National Guard of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia of supplies, materials, and equipment, as authorized by law; and expenses incident to the maintenance and use of supplies, materials, and equipment, including such as may be furnished from stocks under the control of agencies of the Department of Defense; \$87,900,000: <i>Provided</i>, That the number of caretakers authorized to be employed under the provisions of law (32 U. S. C. 42) may be such as is deemed necessary by the Secretary of the Air Force.</p>
--	--

CONTINGENCIES

For emergencies and military expenses, to be expended on the authority or approval of the Secretary of the Air Force, and such expenses may be accounted for solely on his certificate, \$40,600,000.

TITLE VI—GENERAL PROVISIONS

<p>Temporary services by contract.</p> <p>60 Stat. 810.</p> <p>31 U.S.C. § 529. Advances of public moneys.</p> <p>Compensation to noncitizens.</p> <p>Pay and allowances, military personnel.</p>	<p>SEC. 601. During the current fiscal year, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the Air Force, Army, and Navy, respectively, if they should deem it advantageous to the national defense, and if in their opinions the existing facilities of the Department of Defense are inadequate, are authorized to procure services in accordance with section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), but at rates for individuals not in excess of \$50 per day, and to pay in connection therewith travel expenses of individuals, including actual transportation and per diem in lieu of subsistence while traveling from their homes or places of business to official duty station and return as may be authorized by law: <i>Provided</i>, That such contracts may be renewed annually.</p> <p>SEC. 602. Section 3648, Revised Statutes, shall not apply, in the case of payments made from appropriations contained in this Act, (1) to payments made in compliance with the laws of foreign countries or their ministerial regulations, (2) to payments for rent in such countries for such periods as may be necessary to accord with local custom, or (3) to payments made for tuition.</p> <p>SEC. 603. During the current fiscal year, provisions of law prohibiting the payment of compensation to, or employment of, any person not a citizen of the United States shall not apply to personnel of the Department of Defense.</p> <p>SEC. 604. (a) No part of any appropriation contained in this Act for "Pay and allowances" of military personnel shall be used for any other purpose.</p> <p>(b) No part of any appropriation contained in this Act for "Pay and allowances" of military personnel shall be expended for the pay or allowances, accruing after November 30, 1951, of any enlisted member of the inactive or volunteer reserve who served on active duty for a period of twelve months or more in any branch of the Armed Forces during the period beginning December 7, 1941, and ending September 2, 1945, if such member shall have served on active duty</p>
---	---

for a period of sixteen months or more after June 26, 1950, unless such member shall have voluntarily consented to remain on active duty.

SEC. 605. The appropriations in this Act otherwise available for travel or transportation which are current on date of relief from duty station of personnel traveling under orders may be charged with all expenses in connection with such travel including transportation of dependents and household goods, regardless of time of arrival at destination of such personnel. Personnel traveling under orders.

SEC. 606. Appropriations contained in this Act available for travel shall be available for all expenses incident to attendance at meetings of technical, scientific, professional, or other similar organizations. Attendance at meetings.

SEC. 607. No part of any money appropriated in this Act or included under any contract authority granted in this Act shall be expended for the payment of any commission on any land purchase contract in excess of 2 per centum of the purchase price. Commissions on land-purchase contracts.

SEC. 608. Such military and naval personnel as may be detailed for duty with agencies not a part of the Department of Defense on a reimbursement basis may be employed in addition to the numbers otherwise authorized and appropriated for. Personnel detailed to other agencies.

SEC. 609. No collection or reclamation shall be made by the United States on account of any money paid to assignees, transferees, or allottees, or to others for them, under assignments, transfers, or allotments of pay and allowances made under authority of law where liability might exist with respect to such assignments, transfers, or allotments or the use of such moneys, because of the death of assignors, transferors, or allottees. Reclamation of certain payments, restriction.

SEC. 610. Appropriations contained in this Act shall be available for insurance of official motor vehicles in foreign countries, when required by laws of such countries; payments in advance of expenses determined by the investigating officer to be necessary and in accord with local custom for conducting investigations in foreign countries incident to matters relating to the activities of the department concerned; reimbursement of General Services Administration for security guard services for protection of confidential files; examination of estimates of appropriations and Department of Defense activities in the field and the use of such appropriations for such purpose shall be subject only to regulation by the standing committees concerned; and all necessary expenses, at the seat of government of the United States of America or elsewhere, in connection with (1) instruction and training, including tuition, specifically approved by the Secretary of the Department concerned and not otherwise provided for, of civilian employees, and (2) communication and other services and supplies as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act: *Provided*, That no appropriation contained in this Act, and no funds available from prior appropriations to component departments and agencies of the Department of Defense, shall be used to pay tuition or to make other payments to educational institutions in connection with the instruction or training of file clerks, stenographers, and typists receiving, or prospective file clerks, stenographers, and typists who will receive compensation at a rate below the minimum rate of pay for positions allocated to grade GS-5 under the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. Availability of appropriations.

Tuition payments, etc., restriction.

63 Stat. 954.
5 U.S.C. § 1071
note.

Gages, dies, jigs, etc.

SEC. 611. The appropriations contained in this Act for the Air Force, Navy, and for the Army, which are available for the procurement or manufacture of supplies, materials, and equipment of special or technical design may be used for the development and procurement of gages, dies, jigs, and other special aids and appliances, production studies, factory plans, and other production data, including specifications and detailed drawings, and for the purchase of designs, processes

All 65 Stat. 446.

and manufacturing data, copyrights and letters patent, applications therefor, and licenses thereunder pertaining to such supplies, equipment, and materials for which the appropriations are made.

Maintenance of prisoners of war, etc.

SEC. 612. Any appropriation available to the Air Force, Army, or the Navy may, under such regulations as the Secretary concerned may prescribe, be used for expenses incident to the maintenance, pay, and allowances of prisoners of war, other persons in Air Force, Army, or Navy custody whose status is determined by the Secretary concerned to be similar to prisoners of war, and persons detained in such custody pursuant to Presidential proclamation.

Use of receipts from sales, etc.

SEC. 613. During the current fiscal year, without deposit to the credit of the Treasurer of the United States and withdrawal on money requisitions, receipts of public moneys from sales or other sources by officers of the Department of Defense on disbursing duty and charged in their official accounts, except receipts to be credited to river and harbor and flood-control appropriations, may be used by them as required for current expenditures, all necessary bookkeeping adjustments of appropriations, funds, and accounts to be made in the settlement of their disbursing accounts.

Minor construction, etc.

SEC. 614. The Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Air Force, and the Secretary of the Navy are authorized to expend out of the Appropriations in this Act available for construction or maintenance such amounts as may be required for minor construction (except family quarters), extensions to existing structures, and improvements, at facilities of the Department concerned, but the cost of any project authorized under this section which is not otherwise authorized shall not exceed \$50,000, except that the limitation on the cost of any such project which is determined by the Secretary of Defense to be urgently required in the interests of national defense shall not exceed \$200,000: *Provided*, That the cost limitations of this section shall not apply to amounts authorized to be expended for emergency expenses on the approval of the Secretary concerned.

Cost limitation.

Nonapplicability to emergency expenses.

Construction of quarters, limitation.

SEC. 615. During the current fiscal year, appropriations contained in this Act (except those for liquidation of prior contract authorizations) shall not be obligated for construction of family quarters for personnel at a cost per family unit in excess of \$14,040 on housing units for generals; \$12,040 on housing units for majors, lieutenant colonels and colonels, or equivalent; \$11,040 on housing units for second lieutenants, lieutenants, captains, and warrant officers, or equivalent; or \$10,040 on housing units for enlisted personnel, except that when such units are constructed outside the continental United States or in Alaska, the average cost per unit of all such units shall not exceed \$25,850 and in no event shall the individual cost exceed \$35,000. The last proviso of section 3 of the Act of June 12, 1948 (Public Law 626), and the last proviso in the next to last paragraph of section 3 of the Act of June 16, 1948 (Public Law 653), shall not be applicable to appropriations made herein or heretofore to carry out such Acts, in cases where the Secretary of the Department concerned determines that the erection of prefabricated family quarters will be more advantageous to the United States than multiple type dwellings of conventional construction.

62 Stat. 379, 462.

5 U.S.C. § 626p;
10 U.S.C. § 1337b;
34 U.S.C. §§ 911b-911d.

Financing war contracts, etc.
50 U.S.C. app. § 611 note.

64 Stat. 1100.
20 U.S.C. §§ 236-244.

SEC. 616. Appropriations for the Air Force and the Army for the current fiscal year shall be available for carrying out the purposes of Executive Order 9112 of March 26, 1942; for expenses in connection with the administration of occupied areas; for distribution of trophies and devices as authorized by law; for actual and necessary expenses or per diem in lieu thereof authorized by law; and, except as otherwise authorized by the Act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 874), for primary and secondary schooling for dependents of military and

civilian personnel of the Department of Defense residing on military installations or stationed in foreign countries, when the Secretary of the department concerned finds that schools, if any, available in the locality, are unable to provide adequately for the education of such dependents; and appropriations for the Air Force for the current fiscal year shall be available for expenses of temporary duty travel of military personnel and for travel expenses of civilians (other than on permanent change of station) traveling in connection with the activities of the Air Force.

SEC. 617. Appropriations for the Navy for the current fiscal year shall be available for expenses in connection with the transfer to the United States of foreign vessels, including pay, subsistence, transportation, and repatriation of alien crews; expenses including those heretofore incurred incident to the operation by the Navy of private plants taken over at the direction of the President, and the Secretary of the Navy may designate any naval appropriation to be charged with such expenses, proper adjustment to be made on the basis of final costs between applicable appropriations; payment of rewards, as authorized by law, for information leading to the discovery of missing naval property or the recovery thereof, and except as otherwise authorized by the Act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 874), for contributions for the support of schools for dependents of military and civilian personnel of the Department of Defense as authorized by section 13 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 421d).

SEC. 618. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used directly or indirectly except for temporary employment in case of emergency, for the payment of any civilian for services rendered by him on the Canal Zone while occupying a skilled, technical, clerical, administrative, executive, or supervisory position unless such person is a citizen of the United States of America or of the Republic of Panama: *Provided, however*, (1) That, notwithstanding the provision in the Act approved August 11, 1939 (53 Stat. 1409), limiting employment in the above-mentioned positions to citizens of the United States from and after the date of approval of said Act, citizens of Panama may be employed in such positions; (2) that at no time shall the number of Panamanian citizens employed in the above-mentioned positions exceed the number of citizens of the United States so employed, if United States citizens are available in continental United States or on the Canal Zone; (3) that nothing in this Act shall prohibit the continued employment of any person who shall have rendered fifteen or more years of faithful and honorable service on the Canal Zone; (4) that in the selection of personnel for skilled, technical, administrative, clerical, supervisory, or executive positions, the controlling factors in filling these positions shall be efficiency, experience, training, and education; (5) that all citizens of Panama and the United States rendering skilled, technical, clerical, administrative, executive, or supervisory service on the Canal Zone under the terms of this Act (a) shall normally be employed not more than forty hours per week, (b) may receive as compensation equal rates of pay based upon rates paid for similar employment in continental United States plus 25 per centum; (6) this entire section shall apply only to persons employed in skilled, technical, clerical, administrative, executive, or supervisory positions on the Canal Zone directly or indirectly by any branch of the United States Government or by any corporation or company whose stock is owned wholly or in part by the United States Government: *Provided further*, That the President may suspend from time to time in whole or in part compliance with this section if he should deem such course to be in the public interest.

Transfer of
foreign ves-
sels, etc.

64 Stat. 1100.
20 U.S.C. §§ 236-
244.

60 Stat. 854.
Canal Zone.
Citizenship re-
quirements.

Employment of
Panamanian
citizens.
48 U.S.C.
§ 1307 note.

Limitation on
number.

Employees with
15 or more years
of service.

Selection of
personnel.

Hours of employ-
ment; pay rates.

Applicability
of section.

Suspension of
compliance.

Assistance to
American small
business.

SEC. 619. Insofar as practicable, the Secretary of Defense shall assist American small business to participate equitably in the furnishing of commodities and services financed with funds appropriated under this Act by making available or causing to be made available to suppliers in the United States, and particularly to small independent enterprises, information, as far in advance as possible, with respect to purchases proposed to be financed with funds appropriated under this Act, and by making available or causing to be made available to purchasing and contracting agencies of the Department of Defense information as to commodities and services produced and furnished by small independent enterprises in the United States, and by otherwise helping to give small business an opportunity to participate in the furnishing of commodities and services financed with funds appropriated by this Act.

Commuted rations
for enlisted
personnel.
63 Stat. 802.
37 U.S.C. § 231
note.
Operation of
messes.

SEC. 620. During the current fiscal year, commuted rations for enlisted personnel of the uniformed services (as defined in the Career Compensation Act of 1949) on leave, or otherwise authorized to mess separately, shall be equivalent to the cost of the ration as determined by the Secretary of Defense.

Payments for
meals.

SEC. 621. No appropriation contained in this Act shall be available for expenses of operation of messes (other than organized messes which are financed principally from nonappropriated funds) at which meals are sold to officers or civilians except under regulations approved by the Secretary of Defense, which shall (except under unusual or extraordinary circumstances) establish rates for such meals sufficient to provide reimbursement of operating expenses and food costs to the appropriations concerned: *Provided*, That, for the purposes of this section, payments for meals at the rates established hereunder may be made in cash or by deductions from the pay of civilian employees.

Availability
of appropria-
tions.

SEC. 622. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be available until expended unless expressly so provided elsewhere in this or some other appropriation Act.

Tableware, etc.,
in officers'
quarters.

SEC. 623. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be available for or on account of the supply or replacement of table linen, dishes, glassware, silver, and kitchen utensils for use in the residences or quarters of officers on shore (other than for field messes, messes temporarily set up on shore for bachelor officers and officers attached to seagoing or district defense vessels, to aviation units based on seagoing vessels, to the fleet air bases, to the submarine bases, or to landing forces and expeditions), except in accordance with regulations approved by the Secretary of Defense, which shall provide for uniform practices among all of the services.

31 U.S.C.
§ 634a.

SEC. 624. The provisions of the Act of February 9, 1946 (60 Stat. 3), shall be applicable to the appropriations of the Army and Air Force for military pay for the current fiscal year, upon certification by the appropriate agency of the department concerned.

Proceeds from
sale of scrap,
etc.

SEC. 625. Not more than \$10,000,000 of the amounts received during the current fiscal year by each of the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force as proceeds from the sale of scrap or salvage materials, shall be available during the current fiscal year for expenses of transportation, demilitarization, and other preparation for sale or salvage of military supplies, equipment, and matériel: *Provided*, That a report of receipts and disbursements under this limitation shall be made quarterly to the Committees on Appropriations of the Congress.

Report to
Congress.

SEC. 626. During the current fiscal year, the President may exempt appropriations, funds, and contract authorizations, available for military functions under the Department of Defense, from the provisions

31 U.S.C. § 665.

of subsection (c) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended,

whenever he deems such action to be necessary in the interest of national defense.

SEC. 627. Appropriations available during the current fiscal year for the pay and allowances of midshipmen appointed under paragraph (b) of section 3 of the Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1058), as amended (34 U. S. C. 1020b), shall be available for a 50 per centum increase of the pay of such midshipmen while in flight training or on other flight duty.

Midshipmen in flight training, etc.
Pay and allowances.

SEC. 628. No appropriation contained in this Act shall be available on and after January 1, 1952, in connection with the operation of commissary stores of the agencies of the Department of Defense for the cost of purchase (including commercial transportation in the United States to the place of sale but excluding all transportation outside the United States) and maintenance of operating equipment and supplies and for the actual or estimated cost of utilities as may be furnished by the Government and of shrinkage, spoilage, and pilferage of merchandise under the control of such commissary stores, except as authorized under regulations promulgated by the Secretaries of the military departments concerned, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense, which regulations shall provide for reimbursement therefor to the appropriations concerned and, notwithstanding any other provision of law, shall provide for the adjustment of the sales prices in such commissary stores to the extent necessary to furnish sufficient gross revenue from sales of commissary stores to make such reimbursement: *Provided, however,* That under such regulations as may be issued pursuant to this section all utilities may be furnished without cost to the commissary stores outside the continental United States and in Alaska.

Commissary stores.

SEC. 629. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided,* That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit has not contrary to the provisions of this section engaged in a strike against the Government of the United States, is not a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or that such person does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further,* That any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation contained in this Act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both: *Provided further,* That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law.

Persons engaging, etc., in strikes against or advocating overthrow of U.S. Government.

Affidavit.

Penalty clause.

SEC. 630. In order more effectively to administer the programs and functions of the Department of Defense, the President, to the extent he deems it necessary and appropriate in the interest of national defense, may authorize within the Office of the Secretary of Defense

Temporary positions in grades GS-17 and GS-18.

63 Stat. 954.
5 U.S.C. § 1071
note.

Contract pro-
vision regard-
ing gratuities.

ten temporary positions for the fiscal year 1952 to be placed in grades GS-17 and GS-18 of the general schedule of the Classification Act of 1949 in accordance with the procedures and standards of that Act. Not more than five of these positions shall be in grade GS-18. Such positions shall be additional to the number authorized by section 505 of that Act, and not more than four of these positions may be filled by promotion.

SEC. 631. No part of any money appropriated in titles II, III, IV or V of this Act shall be expended under any contract (other than a contract for personal services) entered into after the enactment of this Act unless such contract provides—

(1) that the Government may, by written notice to the contractor, terminate the right of such contractor to proceed under such contract if it is found, after notice and hearing, by the Secretary of the military department with which the contract is made, or his designee, that gratuities (in the form of entertainment, gifts, or otherwise) were offered or given by such contractor, or any agent or representative of such contractor, to any officer or employee of the Government with a view toward securing a contract or securing favorable treatment with respect to the awarding or amending, or the making of any determinations with respect to the performing, of such contract: *Provided*, That the existence of the facts upon which such Secretary makes such findings shall be in issue and may be reviewed in any competent court,

(2) that in the event any such contract is so terminated the Government shall be entitled, (A) to pursue the same remedies against the contractor as it could pursue in the event of a breach of the contract by the contractor, and (B) as a penalty in addition to any other damages to which it may be entitled by law, to exemplary damages in an amount not less than three nor more than ten times (as determined by the Secretary or his designee) the costs incurred by any such contractor in providing any such gratuities to any such officer or employee.

Ceiling on
civilian em-
ployees.

SEC. 632. No funds appropriated in titles II, III, IV, and V of this Act shall be used for the payment in excess of 500,000 full-time graded civilian employees (including (a) the full-time equivalent of part-time employment, (b) persons who are described as "consultants" or who are compensated on a "when actually employed" basis if such persons are employed on a contract basis or are paid on a per diem basis, and (c) persons employed without compensation if they are reimbursed for expenses) at any one time during the current fiscal year.

Restriction
on flight pay.

SEC. 633. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be available for the payment of flight pay to personnel whose actual assigned duties do not involve operational or training flights.

Short title.

SEC. 634. This Act may be cited as the "Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1952".

Approved October 18, 1951.

